	Page 1140				
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
2	DISTRICT OF OREGON				
3	THE HON. MICHAEL J. McSHANE, JUDGE PRESIDING				
4					
5	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)				
6	Government,)				
7	vs.) No. 6:14-cr-00482-MC-1				
8	DANIEL STEPHEN JOHNSON,)				
9	Defendant.)				
10					
11	REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS				
12	EUGENE, OREGON				
13	Tuesday, May 15, 2018				
14	Day 10, Morning and Afternoon				
15	Volume 9 - PAGES 1140 - 1308				
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21	DEBORAH COOK, RPR, CSR OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER				
22	405 East 8th Avenue				
23	Suite 2130 Eugene, Oregon 97401 (541) 431 4463				
24	(541) 431-4162 Deborah_Cook@ord.uscourts.gov				
25					

```
Page 1141
 1
       APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL:
 2
       FOR THE GOVERNMENT:
 3
       Jeffrey S. Sweet
       United States Attorney's Office
 4
       405 E. Eighth Avenue, Suite 2400
       Eugene, OR 97401
 5
       541-465-6771
       Fax: 541-465-6917
 6
       Email: Jeff.sweet@usdoj.gov
 7
       Lauren E. Britsch
       U.S. Department of Justice
 8
       Criminal Division
       1400 New York Ave NW, 6th Floor
9
       Washington, DC 20530
       202-514-2220
10
       Fax: 202-514-1793
       Email: Lauren.britsch@usdoj.gov
11
       Ravi Sinha
12
       United States Attorney's Office
       1000 SW Third Ave, Suite 600
13
       Portland, OR 97204
       503-727-1014
14
       Fax: 503-727-1117
       Email: Ravi.sinha@usdoj.gov
15
       FOR THE DEFENDANT:
16
       Craig E. Weinerman
17
       Office of the Federal Public Defender
       859 Willamette Street, Suite 200
18
       Eugene, OR 97401
       541-465-6937
19
       Fax: 541-465-6975
       Email: Craig weinerman@fd.org
20
       Lisa A. Maxfield
21
       Pacific Northwest Law LLP
       1255 NW Ninth Avenue, No. 11
22
       Portland, OR 97209
       (503) 222-2661
23
       Fax: (503) 222-2864
       Email: Lamaxfield@pacificnwlaw.com
24
                               * * * * *
25
```

			Page	1142
1	WITNESS INDEX			
2		Page/Line		
3	FOR THE DEFENSE:			
4	TRUDY JACOBSEN, PhD DIRECT EXAMINATION	1152 1152	1 10	
5	BY MR. WEINERMAN			
6				
7				
8	Defense Rests JURY INSTRUCTIONS	1178	16 18	
9	GOVERNMENT'S CLOSING ARGUMENT DEFENSE CLOSING ARGUMENT	1185 1209 1239 1285	9 19 16	
10	REBUTTAL CLOSING ARGUMENT			
11	EXHIBIT OFFERED INDEX			
12	EXHIBIT OFFERED INDEX			
13	EXHIBIT RECEIVED INDEX			
14	EXHIBIT 277 RECEIVED	1182	3	
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

PROCEEDINGS

Tuesday, May 15, 2018, at 9:14 a.m.

3

4

1

2

THE COURT: Ready for the jury?

5 6

and that would be the jury instruction on page 27, which is

the elements of counts 1-6, and I think we worked it out.

MR. WEINERMAN: Judge, there's one thing to bring up

7

8

THE COURT: Go ahead. I am sorry.

9

MR. WEINERMAN: The column on nickname, we're asking

10

11

that that be removed. I think the government is willing to do that, and I've agreed just to put those names under name.

12

As the Court knows, the indictment does not name -- put the

13

real names of any of the alleged victims. They identify them

14

15

16

17

18

by number.

So of course, we have no objection to their real name being disclosed to the jury. But since there's really not been any evidence of nicknames, we feel there shouldn't be a nickname column, but the name in the current nickname

19 20

THE COURT: So more -- that's called an Anglicized version of their names instead of their actual native name.

column be put in the name column so there's no confusion.

22

21

MR. WEINERMAN: For example, for BT XXXXXXXXX it

23

would just say under that, BT XX or BT XXXXXXX. So ES XXXXX

24

XXX it would shift from the nickname column, ES XXX or

25

"ES XXX," because I think along the way witnesses have

Page 1144

referred to the alleged victims by the nickname, but not as a nickname, necessarily. And just the whole term "nickname" has not come up, to my knowledge, during the trial.

THE COURT: It's come up a number of times. What is the government's thought?

MR. SINHA: Your Honor, my understanding of Mr. Weinerman's proposal is basically to strike the word "nickname" from the instruction and combine those two columns, and we're fine with that. We're just trying to make sure the jury knows who each count is referring to.

THE COURT: I don't think it's necessary. We can -- I know the witnesses have actually used the word "nickname" in describing their own various names. I don't know how that actually translates, but the fact is, every alleged victim in the case is operating under at least two names, at various times.

I think we have generally known them by their shortened easier names, which are either nicknames or some of them are Anglicized names, so -- I think we have both names available to the jury so they can clarify. Some may be taking notes under the name they spelled out to the jury as their formal names. Others may have taken notes using the more general nickname, for want of a better word. I don't know how else to call it.

MR. WEINERMAN: Judge, the last thing I will say

Page 1145

about this is I realize the Court is not sending the indictment back to the jury. The indictment does not refer to the term "nickname". The indictment has the name by number of each victim. So again, I am not asking the Court to send the indictment back, because that doesn't help the jury very much because it just has numbers, rather than names.

But it just seems to me that additional information that is not in the indictment, we should keep to a minimum because the Grand Jury has returned an indictment, not based on these names, but on numbers.

So it just seems to me we should limit the amount of extraneous information. Nickname is not a concept that has been put into the indictment. So I -- again, I don't oppose the jury knowing which number refers to which alleged victim, but I think we should be careful about labeling these names as nicknames when that's not in the indictment.

As the Court knows, the government can allege in the indictment aka's. We know why they didn't do it in this case, we understand that. But we think the whole concept of nickname since it's not in the indictment should not be sent back to the jury in this instruction.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, I want both names on the this chart to go to the jury so there's no confusion, because multiple names have been used. We can strike "nickname" and

put "also known as". I don't know if that is helping you anymore than nickname.

MR. WEINERMAN: No, I don't think we should do that. But again, the substance, the names that may have been referred to, we have no objection to that. I really -- I can boil the argument down, and ask that the word "nickname" be stricken from this instruction.

THE COURT: And keep both columns.

MR. WEINERMAN: Sure, we can keep both columns. I don't mind that.

THE COURT: We will strike nickname. I think it's clear that there are two names for each minor victim. I assume you will clarify that a little bit in your closing arguments.

MR. SINHA: We will. And as I told Mr. Weinerman, we have slides that say "nickname" so he's agreed we don't have to change them.

We have one other thing we would like to raise with the Court. But the first one is with regards to the alternate jurors. I don't know what the Court's plan is in terms of dismissing the alternate jurors. We would ask the Court to consider perhaps keeping them under -- I don't know if it's sequestration, or the Court's instruction so we can use them in case we lose somebody during deliberations.

THE COURT: We will keep them through closing

Page 1147

argument, and I instruct them not to deliberate with their fellow jurors but to say their goodbyes and then also not to discuss the case with anybody in the event that we have --something remarkable were to happen, we would have to call one of them in to begin deliberations all over. And then we will call them as soon as a verdict comes in to let them know.

MR. SINHA: Thank you, Your Honor.

MS. BRITSCH: Sorry. Two more brief issues. First, for the record, we would like to note the two interpreters used for the government, Pauline Laurent and Rithy Lim are both certified by the State of California as Court certified interpreters in Khmer, and they were used for witnesses that primarily speak Khmer, rather than English. So we wanted to note that for the record.

And secondly, I believe there may be one area of dispute with respect to the defense's expert witness who is about to testify. Mr. Weinerman has indicated he may still seek to have her testify about police tactics regarding interviewing children. We still maintain an objection to that. That's outside of her area of expertise.

So I just wanted to note that for the Court in case the Court would like to address that before she gets on the stand.

MR. WEINERMAN: And, Judge, and I am going to try to

Page 1148

lay a foundation. I will just tell the Court I learned this morning that she did some work for the UN in Cambodia. I am trying to read my writing -- UN Transitional Authority in which she was involved with studying the interviewing techniques of witnesses and child witnesses so she is familiar. And I think she can testify about the lack of training in that area, that they are not trained in the techniques and the concepts of interviewing child witnesses.

So I think she does qualify in that very limited area. It's not going to be a major part of our presentation, but I think it is relevant and she should be allowed to testify about it.

THE COURT: I think you need a child forensics psychologist who specializes in this area; otherwise, you can call anybody who can Google the issue on the Internet and say what they found out. That's not her expertise. There really hasn't been evidence in this case presented by the defense that the interviews themselves in this case were defective.

Certainly you can put on a forensic child psychologist and say, I reviewed the interviews and they were inappropriate. They led the witness, they suggested answers, they forced the witness to answer when the witness didn't want to. Some of the general things we often hear in these kinds of cases. They were interviewed around too many people.

The list goes on for the kinds of issues that a forensic psychologist would raise in really any sex abuse interview. But putting a history professor on to talk about it seems to go too far, so I would sustain the objection.

MS. BRITSCH: Thank you, Your Honor. I don't think we have anything else before the jury comes in.

MR. WEINERMAN: One minute, Judge.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. WEINERMAN: Judge, I am informed we have an unresolved objection to Exhibit 277 which is in front of me. So there are three areas. The first one -- and just for context, this is a chat between BT XXXXXXXX and Knot Mariah. I am not going to try to pronounce the last name. Who, at one time, was in a relationship with Daniel Johnson, for some context.

And this takes place on the day Mr. Johnson was arrested, December 9, 2013. So unlike other texts that the Court has permitted with BT XXXXXXXX complaining about things before Mr. Johnson was arrested, this text occurred after he was arrested. So the first one we're objecting to is Mr. BT X saying, "I will tell you because you are my dear sis," and then a minute later texting, "he committed sexual."

We're also objecting to two lines down. "I don't know for sure, but I just know he had sex with one of the boy in the center." And we feel that that is not relevant, or

Page 1150

the Court should exercise its discretion under 403 in that he's not identifying a particular person, unlike some of the other instances where he does. And then finally, he also texts to Knot Mariah that "When I talked with him about this he cried a lot, and he wanted to commit suicide." And we think the part about committing suicide should go out under relevancy on 403 grounds.

THE COURT: How many pages is the exhibit, because I am only seeing one page?

MR. WEINERMAN: The actual exhibit looks like it's five pages.

THE COURT: I am going to need a copy, because I am not able to scroll on the screen. I am only seeing one page.

MR. SWEET: I can give the Court a copy of 277, which I just marked on and highlighted. And I have a slightly longer version of the chat, which has some of the parts that we removed and I can provide both of those to the Court.

And I will say this, Your Honor, the conversation appears to potentially split between a discussion that Mr. BT X had regarding a boy who may have disclosed during the arrest, and then also discussions prior to the arrest, because it indicates that he confronted Mr. Johnson. So I think there's a little bit of a split with pre-arrest and post-arrest conduct.

MR. WEINERMAN: And, Judge, to add to the context,
Mr. BT X is in the United States when this conversation, this
chat is being held, and Knot Mariah, we believe Knot Mariah
was in Korea at the time. So neither of them are in
Cambodia. Doesn't mean they can't have information about
what is going on there, but it seems to me that it's somewhat
speculative. Two people in two different countries talking
about something that occurred in Cambodia, and it just
doesn't seem that it should go to the jury. It's confusing,
and it's irrelevant.

THE COURT: All right. How about I take a look at it while our first witness this morning is testifying, and then we can break and I will rule a little bit more. Let's bring in the jury.

(JURY IN.)

THE COURT: Please be seated. Welcome back. Thank you. We're now going to hear from the final witness for the defense.

Mr. Weinerman, your next witness.

MR. WEINERMAN: Yes, Judge. The defense would call Dr. Trudy Jacobsen.

THE COURT: Go ahead and step up to the witness stand, and remain standing and you will be sworn in.

24 //

25 | //

Page 1152 1 TRUDY JACOBSEN, PhD, produced as a witness, having been first duly sworn, was 2 examined and testified as follows: 3 THE WITNESS: I do. 4 5 COURT CLERK: Please be seated. State your name for 6 the record, spelling your first and last. 7 THE WITNESS: Trudy Anne Jacobsen, T-R-U-D-Y, A-N-N-E, J-A-C-O-B-S-E-N. 8 9 DIRECT EXAMINATION 10 BY MR. WEINERMAN: 11 12 Can I call you Dr. Jacobsen? Q Α Yes. 13 14 Because you have a PhD? 15 Α Correct. Can you please tell the ladies and gentlemen of the jury 16 Q how you are employed. 17 18 I am tenured at the rank of full professor at Northern 19 Illinois University in DeKalb, Illinois. 20 Can you tell us the areas of the subjects, the topics 21 that you teach and you write about at that university, and other areas? 22 I teach at the undergraduate and graduate level, courses 23 in anthropology, political culture, ethnography, gender and 24 sexuality studies, and history, specifically in Southeast 25

- 1 Asia. And my country of research, primarily, is Cambodia.
- 2 Q And you mentioned Cambodian culture?
- 3 A Yes.
- 4 Q And could you give us a general idea of some of the
- 5 | classes you teach in these subjects?
- 6 A Certainly. Gender and sexuality in Southeast Asia,
- 7 | Buddhist Southeast Asia, history of genocide, history of
- 8 Cambodia, ethnographic methods, doing research in developing
- 9 countries.
- 10 Q Could you give us a brief background on your educational
- 11 | background?
- 12 A Certainly, I hold undergraduate degrees in history and
- 13 anthropology, double major. First class honors from the
- 14 Columbia University of Queensland in Brisbane, Australia, and
- 15 a PhD in history.
- 16 Q From what university?
- 17 A From the university of Queensland.
- 18 Q And just give us a little background about where you
- 19 grew up?
- 20 A Certainly.
- 21 Q Where you lived up until now?
- 22 A Both of my parents worked in development. My father was
- 23 a soil scientist, my mother is an epidemiologist. I grew up
- 24 in Algeria, Indonesia, and Cambodia. And my mother first
- went to Cambodia when I was 13 years old. She was one of the

- 1 | first 50 nonSoviet technical experts allowed into Cambodia to
- 2 assist with the reconstruction of the country after the Khmer
- 3 register in 1988.
- 4 Q And I judge from your accent you were born in --
- 5 A I am Australian.
- 6 Q And you lived the first how many years of your life
- 7 | there?
- 8 A Four and a half, Algeria for three, Indonesia for five
- 9 and a half, Cambodia since I was 13.
- 10 Q Tell us about living in Cambodia from the age of 13 on?
- 11 A The country was still very much under the control of the
- 12 Vietnamese, who assisted with the liberation of Cambodia from
- 13 the Khmer Rouge in 1979. They had a shadow presence as a
- 14 government for ten years until 1989.
- 15 Foreigners were not permitted to live in houses.
- 16 | were expected to live in three different hotels. The United
- 17 Nations and other aid agencies had to run their offices out
- 18 of one particular hotel. Western technical experts and
- 19 program officers were not allowed to interact with the Soviet
- 20 | technical experts.
- 21 There was a nightly curfew of 8:00 p.m. Schools
- 22 | were few and far between. I, myself, carried out
- 23 | correspondence studies until my senior year of high school in
- 24 | 1991 when I returned to Australia to take my baccalaureate
- 25 there.

- 1 Q Did you attend school when you were a teenager in 2 Cambodia?
- A I was carrying out correspondence classes. I also had

 Saturday jobs typing reports for many of the nongovernmental

 organizations, since I was foreign.

I learned Khmer when I was living in Cambodia with my mother. But I was unable to read or write it until I started doing my PhD thesis on Cambodia in the year 2000.

- Q Let's talk about your language proficiency in Khmer.
- 10 Would you tell us about that, please?

6

7

8

9

11

16

17

18

19

20

interacting with friends and people in Cambodia. Therefore,
I was in an unusual position in 1992 when the United Nations
transitional authority in Cambodia came in to begin to
prepare for the elections in Cambodia in 1993, in that I

spoke a more accurate version of Khmer from the 1980s and

1990s than many experts that had learned Khmer in the 1960s.

I did not have formal classes. I learned Khmer from

- THE COURT: You are going to have to slow down a little bit. We have a court reporter who has to take everything down.
- THE WITNESS: I am sorry, ma'am.
- Q BY MR. WEINERMAN: What is your reading and writing proficiency?
- A When I began taking my PhD, I carried out formal
 instruction in Cambodia in reading and writing, so I am able

- 1 to read and write proficiently.
- 2 Q Do you have experience observing Cambodian culture?
- 3 A I do, both formally and informally. My mother
- 4 established the cold chain in Cambodia, which is the system
- 5 | for keeping vaccines safe as they are carried to rural places
- 6 | in order to carry out mass vaccinations. So I was,
- 7 | therefore, able to see a great deal of Cambodia in the late
- 8 | 1980s and early 1990s. I also maintained a residence in
- 9 Cambodia from 1999 until after my son was born in the year
- 10 2010.
- 11 | Q Tell us about, I think you mentioned work with the
- 12 United Nations. Tell us about your work with that, and what
- 13 you did?
- 14 A When I finished secondary school I returned to Cambodia.
- 15 I believe I took what was one of the earliest gap years. It
- 16 was the late -- no, early 1990s, and I wanted to work in
- 17 Cambodia before I went to university to take a degree. And
- 18 | it so happened that the Paris Peace Accord had been signed in
- 19 1989.
- 20 Q We ought to back up. And one or two sentences on what
- 21 | that was?
- 22 A The UN came in to educate people on how to have an
- 23 election and how to vote. I was in the fortunate position of
- 24 | speaking English, French, and Khmer. I was hired by the
- 25 | human rights component, particularly the investigation and

- 1 | monitoring team. Our responsibility was to carry out
- 2 | investigations into politically motivated intimidation,
- 3 | harassment, assault and death. And also to train local law
- 4 | enforcement agents on how to carry out similar
- 5 investigations.
- 6 Q So how long did that go on, your work with the UN?
- 7 A I worked for the UN from March of 1992 until September
- 8 of 1993.
- 9 Q And have you published numerous articles and
- 10 | peer-reviewed monographs on aspects of Cambodian society,
- 11 religion, and politics?
- 12 A Yes. I have two single monographs specifically on
- 13 Cambodia, published in 2008 and 2017, and I believe 40 peer
- 14 reviewed book chapters or general articles.
- MR. WEINERMAN: We would ask the Court to allow her
- 16 to testify as an expert on Cambodian history and culture.
- 17 MS. BRITSCH: No objection, Your Honor.
- 18 THE COURT: I will. Thank you.
- 19 Q BY MR. WEINERMAN: Dr. Jacobsen, let me start with a
- 20 | real basic question. Is Cambodia a poor country?
- 21 A It is among the poorest in Southeast Asia.
- 22 Q And could you explain why it is one of the poorest
- 23 | countries in Southeast Asia?
- 24 A Certainly. From the 1960s on, Cambodia began
- 25 experiencing a civil insurgency, which affected the ability

Page 1158

of rural communities to produce regular crops of rice. The Vietnam conflict, which was happening at the same time, drove many people from farming into the cities seeking refuge.

Infrastructure, which was never particularly good in Cambodia since the French colonial period, began to falter. Unemployment rose, even though young people had been promised that education would lead to good government jobs, they did not eventuate. Many people were disillusioned and went to join the socialists, who they believed would provide them with a more equitable future in Cambodia as opposed to the capitalism and corruption they saw from the existing regime.

In 1970 the leader of the government, Sihanouk, S-I-H-A-N-O-U-K, was deposed in a coup. He sought exile in China, and soon joined the Khmer Rouge who promised to reinstate him if --

Q Tell us briefly who the Khmer Rouge was?

A The Khmer Rouge -- there were two groups of the Khmer Rouge. One is lasting from the 1930s with Ho Chi Min IndoChinese Communist Party. Cambodians who were disillusioned with the idea of colonialism and capitalism joined in a vision of social utopia in mainland Southeast Asia.

Another group, people who were educated in France during the colonial period, and they came into contact with French communists and socialists in the 1940s and '50s began

Page 1159

to spread ideas of a socialist government. During the 1950s and '60s, when political parties were allowed to form, these people tried to participate in usual political activities and were repressed by the Sihanouk's government. They went and joined the former communists --

Q Let's move a little more into more modern times, and again, the context of the question is why is Cambodia a poor country, whether we get into employment, lack of education, things like that. So we can -- so we have information about the current situation in Cambodia in terms of poverty.

A Definitely. In 1979 when the Khmer Rouge were deposed, a quarter of the population had either died of malnutrition, torture, purges by the Khmer Rouge, or had fled the country to neighboring Thailand and Vietnam.

Q So you are saying it lost a quarter of its population either to immigration or death?

A Fleeing rather than immigration. And even before the Khmer Rouge took power, the educated elite had managed to get out of the country fleeing to France or the United States, where they remained during the Khmer Rouge period.

In 1979 the Vietnamese assisted the remaining
Cambodians, many of whom did not have the necessary skills to
rehabilitate their own country in beginning to get the
country back together. This was hampered by the fact the
Khmer Rouge continued a civil war against the Cambodians

until 1997. Apart from a brief period during the UN, when they agreed to participate in the elections and then reneged.

With all of the civil war, it was very difficult for Cambodia to continue to grow their own food, to reconstruct what little infrastructure had been in place previously, and the government was dealing with a civil insurgency as opposed to trying to rehabilitate the country.

There was very little investment in education, very little investment in social programs that we would expect in a country of Cambodia's size.

- Q So fast forward to more recent times, like today, if you know, what the average per capita gross income is, of the average Cambodian --
- A GDP is \$3,700 on paper, but this is skewed because there are a group of very, very rich Cambodians, and there are a large number of Cambodians who are extremely poor, so the average is misleading.

The majority of Cambodians living in a rural situation would be largely subsistence farmers, small livestock holders, and existing on remittances from family members working in the cities, and whatever cottage industries they are able to produce.

- Q So let's talk about what is going on right now. Tell us about the urban population, the capital is Phnom Penh,
- 25 | correct?

- A Correct.
- 2 Q What percentage of Cambodians live in the urban area of
- 3 | Phnom Pehn?

1

- 4 A The official statistics state that 90 percent of
- 5 Cambodians are rural dwellers. This is also misleading
- 6 because when people are not required to perform agricultural
- 7 | tasks, so for example, when you are not planting rice or
- 8 harvesting rice, it has been traditional for people to go to
- 9 the cities to seek other forms of temporary labor.
- 10 It's very common for men, particularly, to come to
- 11 | the cities to provide public transport on their motorbikes or
- 12 tuk tuk, et cetera. And then once they are needed back in
- 13 the countryside, they will return then. So the population is
- 14 | fluctuating.
- 15 Q So let's talk about, if this is the right term, the
- 16 migration of people, particularly young people, from the
- 17 | rural areas, agricultural areas, into the cities.
- 18 A Sociologists and demographers have noted that
- 19 particularly in the last ten years, with foreign investment
- 20 | increasing in Cambodia, in the form of establishing many
- 21 | factories, such as the Gap factory, Banana Republic, who have
- 22 | factories in the north of Phnom Penh, increasingly South
- 23 | Korea and Chinese businesses are choosing to manufacture in
- 24 | Cambodia as well, because labor is cheaper than in their own
- 25 | countries, a large number of young people, particularly,

don't want to stay and grow rice. They want to come to the 1 cities and take what they perceive as more lucrative jobs in 2 3 these factories, believing that they will then be able to enjoy consumer goods such as cell phones, TVs, and remit 4 money back to their families living in the rural countryside. 5 6 So there's a shift in population from the rural areas to 7 the urban areas, but we don't know in terms of numbers? 8 No. I mean there are some studies, but they are on one

Do they have a census in Cambodia?

9

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

11 They do. I believe the next one is due to be carried 12 out in 2019.

province at a time, so we don't have a good idea.

So tell us about the educational opportunities in the rural areas versus the urban areas. And again, what parents of young kids in the rural areas do in terms of educating their kids.

At the village level, which may be ten houses with rice paddies in common that they farm, children will often walk an hour to the nearest school, as a matter of course. children want to go to the high school -- there's only a primary school and high school. There's no middle school in Cambodia -- they will often have to use some other form of transport to get to a high school in a larger town. Or, which is more common, they will have to go live with a relative in that larger town.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 1163

If people wish to go to university or vocational training, they have to go and live in the capital city of Phnom Penh. It is not a common cultural practice for people to go and live alone in Cambodia, rent an apartment. There's no dormitory attached to the university. Therefore, the expectation is you will go and live with family. So what about elementary school? Kids who are elementary school, middle school age who live in the rural areas, agricultural areas? Has there been a shift of population of those kids leaving their parents, if they exist, and leaving the agricultural areas and moving to cities, like Phnom Penh, for education? Since the UN election, parents have realized increasingly that for their families to get ahead, English language is important. There is no English language instruction in the elementary school system in Cambodia. So most parents will send their children to the local school, and then send them to an international school where they will learn English or Chinese or Korean, is becoming increasingly But those private schools for language instruction don't exist in the countryside. They exist in the larger cities. Battambang, B-A-T-T-A-M-B-A-N-G, and the capital, Phnom Penh. So if -- the kids who wind up in Phnom Penh for educational purposes, what has your observation been as far

as their parental situation, whether they have parents to send them, whether they are orphans, explain that to us.

A There is no data listing the numbers of children who have been sent from the countryside. It is, however, an extremely common practice. Almost -- I would imagine, most children who are in Phnom Penh attending an international school are not originally from the city center itself.

Q In Cambodia does the state provide educational services, or are there other organizations that fill that void?

A The state provides schools, and a teacher in the school. The teacher is usually poorly paid in comparison to what we would see in the United States, and often has a second job tutoring or teaching in a private school.

Parents are expected to provide school uniforms, buy text books, and exercise books, pencils, et cetera. Into the void for language instruction have stepped a number of organizations. For example, the Australian Center for English has a variety of scholarships funded by private donors for Cambodians who wish to learn English to attend. And there are similar schools that have private donor schemes to provide instruction for students.

Q Are there private organizations, of NGOs, religious organizations, that provide services, education, shelter, food for young people who live in the city Phnom Penh?

A Certainly. In fact, in the absence of government

- 1 | services, particularly -- and this is my area -- people who
- 2 | are survivors of trafficking or domestic violence, rape,
- 3 there are no government services for them. Therefore, the
- 4 only recourse people in this situation have is to go to
- 5 either nonprofit organizations funded by foreign governments,
- 6 or faith-based organizations, not necessarily Christian.
- 7 | There is an organization called CAMAN, which is funded,
- 8 C-A-M-A-N -- which is funded from Malaysia, and donations
- 9 | from the Middle East, for example.
- There are organizations that have been set up to
- 11 provide a place for children to live while they attend high
- 12 | school and university that is privately funded from Belgium.
- 13 And Somaly Mam Foundation for victims of trafficking and
- 14 child sex abuse, et cetera, which is probably one of the more
- 15 | famous ones.
- 16 Q Some of the organizations that provide these services
- 17 | are faith based?
- 18 A Yes.
- 19 Q And different religious denominations?
- 20 A Absolutely.
- 21 Q Including Christian organizations --
- 22 A Including different denominations of Christian --
- 23 | there's a Morman one, Presbyterian one. There's a Scottish
- 24 Methodist one. I believe every denomination would be
- 25 represented if we did a survey.

Page 1166

Q So would it be fair to say that if someone wants to be upwardly mobile, if a parent wants their child to be upwardly mobile, their best bet is to get out of the rural areas to get into the urban areas for education support?

A Absolutely. There are very few resources available for rural parents who wish their children to get what would be considered a comprehensive education and be able to enter into a job in a lucrative sector, such as tourism, where either English, Korean, or Chinese is necessary.

Q During this trial we have heard the term "orphanage." We have heard the term "center." Could you tell us your observations about orphanages in terms of the parents, are there parents, are the parents alive, are the parents deceased? What are the criteria?

Let me ask it this way: What is the criteria and the ability to verify the criteria for a child, let's say from a rural area being able to live in an orphanage or center in Cambodia, in Phnom Penh, in order to access the services that are available there?

A Being an orphan in Cambodia is simply somebody who either does not know where their parents are, or has not seen them for an extended period of time, or is not living with them. And there is a cultural tradition in Cambodia of parents sending their children to live with more affluent relatives in order to access educational services or to pay a

debt. And the child would receive education in return for doing chores around the house.

Living apart from your parents in Cambodia was never something that was odd or uncommon. The existence of orphanages really began in Cambodia after the Khmer Rouge period when so many children had lost parents, and they did not know where they were.

- Q In the West, our conception of orphanages is your parents are deceased. Is that the same thing in Cambodia?
- A It is not.

- 11 Q So I want to ask you a few questions about the system of
 12 documenting births in Cambodia. Do they have a similar
 13 system like we have here in the West?
 - A Well, no. To begin with, most births would be carried out in the home. Nobody comes by with paperwork when a baby is born. The onus is on the parents to go and register a birth.

need for the child's existence to be documented, so for example, to go to a school. Most children don't get issued a birth certificate. A parent will go to the village chief and state this child has been born on this date, this is their name, and the village chief should keep a record in the village. Many do not.

In some villages the system is you go to the nearest

- 1 district capital and register there. This, again, might be a
- 2 long way away, and somebody may not have a reason to go to
- 3 | the district capital for months or years. And, therefore,
- 4 also the ability of a central authority in Phnom Penh, for
- 5 example, to issue a driver's license or a passport might not
- 6 have any way of getting to the person responsible for record
- 7 keeping at the district level.
- 8 Q Is registration contemporaneous with the birth, or not
- 9 | necessarily?
- 10 A Not necessarily.
- 11 Q We talked a little bit about the civil servant system in
- 12 Cambodia. Government jobs, village jobs, how are they paid?
- 13 A The government does have a budget for civil servants,
- 14 and included in that categorization are teachers, police
- 15 officer, magistrates, village chiefs, et cetera. They are
- 16 very poorly paid. For example, a mid-level police officer in
- 17 Phnom Penh makes \$240 a month, which is not enough, even in a
- 18 | country like Cambodia that is less expensive in terms of
- 19 paying rent and food, it is not enough to support a family.
- 20 Therefore, almost everybody there has another job and a
- 21 | family business, probably.
- 22 Q Are there other ways to supplement one's income, other
- 23 than a second job?
- 24 A Certainly. There's a concept in Cambodia called Ahasai.
- 25 Q You have to spell that one.

A I am about to. A-H-A-S-A-I. It literally means cords, and it's a system wherein everybody is in some form of reciprocal relationship. So if your uncle lives in the district capital, you are a farmer, you will make sure you send mangoes to that uncle, so if it happens that you get into some legal trouble, he will be able to pull strings for you so that nothing too bad happens to you. If you are a student, you should bring a present of some kind to your teacher. And the teacher then will emit goodwill towards you.

This sometimes can be corrupted. There have been some very famous cases of teachers at the law school not allowing students to sit for the law exam, because they hadn't received a nice enough present. But everyone is in some kind of obligation to each other.

Q So this is part of the culture?

- A Yes, it's not perceived as corruption.
 - Q So I have some questions about some of the cultural practices in Cambodia that may be different than ours. First of all, could you talk a bit about -- not immigration policies of the United States -- but the movement of population out of Cambodia due to poverty and other reasons?

 A Certainly. I mainly work with women who are trying to obtain a marriage partner in the West, particularly, but increasingly in China, South Korea, as these places become

more affluent.

And the reason for this is the majority of people who had some form of dual citizenship, whether the United States or France, before the Khmer Rouge were able to escape and be safe, and then be able to return to Cambodia. During the Khmer Rouge period, obviously people are aware of the genocide, the suffering, family members dying, horrible malnutrition, tortures and death, and for this reason people in Cambodia never feel quite secure about not being able to get out of the country.

And increasingly, anyone with any financial assets don't want to keep them in Cambodia. They want to keep them in another country where they know what happened under the Khmer Rouge was the obliteration of money, bank accounts, deeds of property were completely obliterated never to be recovered. So it's seen as insurance, having a passport to another country.

- Q And in general, how do people go about leaving Cambodia if they can, and where do they want to go?
- A Those with enough money are able to send their university age children to other countries to go to school.

 So New Zealand, Australia, the United States, France, Western countries, and Japan to some extent.

Once people have a visa to study in a country, it's relatively easy to convert it to permanent residency and then

Page 1171

citizenship. That's one avenue, but that's only available to very wealthy people.

Women often try to form relationships leading to marriage with men who do visit Cambodia quite often. And often older men come to Cambodia looking for a younger woman who might like to come back and live with them in their home country. This is another avenue. It's becoming more and more difficult, however, for these visas to be issued by a country such as United Kingdom and Germany have been cracking down on this for some time. This did not begin in Cambodia, but in other countries there has been -- there are often visas --

MS. BRITSCH: Objection, Your Honor. I am going to object to the relevance of immigration visas in other countries.

THE COURT: Sustained.

Q BY MR. WEINERMAN: So how -- you talked about what wealthy people try to do to leave Cambodia. What about poor people? What are the options available to them if they want to leave the poverty of Cambodia, to leave and go to a Western country?

A Sometimes they will sign on to work units, for example, working in construction in Vietnam or Thailand. And once there, try and remain in those countries, and from there springboard to others in the West. Some people use work

- visas to come to a country, such as the United States, on a six-month work visa, and then stay. Others use other means, such as special visa categories, where they can go to, for example, give -- to go to a wedding, and then they will stay and overstay their visa, and not have a legal reason to be in that country anymore.
- There are other options however, people can convert --
- THE COURT: You need to slow way, way down, or we're not going to get all of this on the record.
- 11 Q BY MR. WEINERMAN: Again, getting back to a poorer
 12 person, is there an option available to at least try to come
 13 to a Western country to study?
- 14 A Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

- Q And how would someone who is poor, who doesn't have the financial means, how would they go about doing that?
- A Usually they would have to come to the attention of a private donor or organization that would fund such an
- 19 activity for someone. Particularly in the Cham community in
- 20 Cambodia who are Muslims, wealthy Malaysians are funding Cham
- 21 Muslim kids to come study in Malaysia, for example.
- 22 Q So you would need a benefactor?
- 23 A You would. You would not be able to do it yourself.
- Q You may have touched upon this, but in general, do
- 25 people in Cambodia, are they still concerned about their

safety in remaining in Cambodia?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

rhetoric.

A Yes. Even though things have been very calm, as the civil war has been ended now for some time, over 20 years, there is still a fear in Cambodia that these things could happen again, the genocide could happen again. There is also a fear from current -- the current government, which has recently taken a turn towards being very oppressive with the elimination of all other political parties recently, the closing of newspapers that are anti-government in their

But also people are sort of victims of the state as the state sells off land, and they evict people without providing an alternative accommodation. And when people protest, even peacefully, the government responds very violently. So state agents are not seen in Cambodia as people to trust. They are seen as people of whom you should be scared.

- Q What is the Prime Minister's name?
- 19 A Hun Sen, H-U-N, S-E-N.
- 20 Q And how long has he been the Prime Minister?
- A He has held high government office since 1984. He was elected Prime Minister in 1993 in the UN election, and has remained there.
- Q In your opinion, are there free and fair elections in Cambodia?

A I believe the 1993 election was free and fair. The others, which have occurred every five years, have become increasingly beset with electoral irregularities.

1

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

22

23

24

25

- Q The second-to-last area, talk about some of the domestic culture. First, sleeping arrangements in a family. Could you touch upon that a little bit? What might be a little different than what we're accustomed to in the West?
 - A First of all, the concept of family, it's not a nuclear family. Many extended family members will live together in one household, especially in rural areas. A household might be one room. It's simply one room. Everybody sleeps in the same room under different mosquito nets.

But people share sleeping mats. People share beds. I have seen as many as six children in a double bed together. This is a normal practice. There's only one bed. If it's very hot, people might sleep under the house, as well as in it. But everyone is sleeping together. The concept of privacy is not really that common.

- Q How about adults sharing the same bed with children?
- 20 A Yes, that's very common. There is usually only one bed 21 elevated off the floor.
 - Q Might there be other reasons for adults and children to share beds, other than the lack of space?
 - A Well, malaria and dengue fever are very serious problems in Cambodia, and the acquisition of a Deet net are very

effective against eliminating those diseases, might mean only

2 one exists per family, so everybody will get underneath it.

Q When you are talking about adults sleeping in the same bed with children, are they part of the nuclear family, or

are there other adults who could be in that arrangement?

A Other adults, depending on the particular family

dynamic. It's not considered to be a sexual thing.

Q Let's talk a little bit, we have heard a lot of testimony in this case about massage, massaging. Could you tell us about the custom of massaging in Cambodia?

A Again, it's not considered to be a prelude to sexual behavior, as I believe it is in the West. It's considered to be medicinal. And there are other -- apart from massage, there's things such as cupping or coining, which is when you take a coin and run it down various parts of the body, depending on what is afflicting you at the particular time.

And it's common for household members to perform these tasks, and others that, I guess, we would consider grooming, such as searching the hair for lice, to be a function of existing in the same household.

Q And the attire that is worn, there's been some testimony about people getting massages without a shirt on. Is that common, or is the custom that the person receiving the massage is fully clothed?

A I have never seen anyone in Cambodia getting a massage

- 1 being fully clothed.
- 2 Q Partially clothed?
- 3 A It is -- if someone is going to a doctor or a
- 4 practitioner of massage or coining in order to receive
- 5 | treatment for some ailment, you are not wearing your clothes.
- 6 You will be asked to remove them to receive this treatment.
- 7 If it is being carried out in the household, people wouldn't
- 8 be fully clothed anyway, because most people have only one
- 9 set of good clothes that they wear to work or university or
- 10 to school. So as soon as you come home, Cambodia is very hot
- 11 and your clothes soil easily. So people will remove them and
- 12 | put on something comfortable.
- For women, it might be loose pajamas. For men, it
- 14 | might be baggy pajama pants, or a sarong, or something like
- 15 that until everyone has a shower before they leave the house
- 16 again, putting their good clothes on again.
- 17 Q So using -- not wearing good clothes inside the house?
- 18 A Right.
- 19 Q You mentioned wearing a sarong, a short --
- 20 A Like a length of cotton cloth that you just tie around
- 21 your waist. Women would tie it around up here (indicating),
- 22 or wearing sort of pajama shorts or shorts. Something like
- 23 that, just something loose and comfortable.
- Q What about men wearing a very short attire around their
- 25 waste covering their private parts, not having a shirt on,

- 1 have you observed that in Cambodia?
- 2 A As long as your genitals are covered, and breasts for
- 3 women, you are not considered to be risque or obscene. It
- 4 | would be normal.
- 5 Q Is there any cultural connotation to someone,
- 6 particularly a male, just wearing a short covering over the
- 7 | lower part of their body?
- 8 A No.
- 9 Q Perhaps what I was getting at, and I hope I can spell
- 10 this right, the concept of O-M-N-A-I-C-H, "Omnaich," tell us
- 11 about that.
- 12 A Omnaich, so in Cambodia there are different forms of
- 13 power you can have in society. One of them is sel, which is
- 14 | a kind of Buddhist, you are a good Buddhist. You perform
- 15 good work. Omnaich is political power, so you have the
- 16 ability to make other people do what you want to be done,
- 17 | like charisma, I think we would call it in the West.
- 18 Omnaich, you have Omnaich if you are the quietest
- 19 one at a business meeting. Everybody else is talking and
- 20 arguing. The person who has Omnaich at the table is the
- 21 person who doesn't say a word, they don't need to. But when
- 22 they do speak, everyone else is quiet.
- 23 | Q Who normally occupies those types of positions?
- 24 A In society, it's people who have the ability to make
- 25 | your life miserable. So people like the police, for example,

Page 1178 the tax collectors. In relation to students, teachers have 1 more Omnaich than the students do. In the household, it's 2 the head of the household, which may not necessarily be the 3 father, sometimes it's the mother, or sometimes it's an uncle 4 5 whose house it is, but he's allowing his relatives to live 6 there. It depends on the circumstances. 7 MR. WEINERMAN: Let me just check my notes. I have 8 no further questions. 9 THE COURT: Cross-examination. MS. BRITSCH: Thank you. We have no questions, Your 10 11 Honor. 12 THE COURT: Thank you, Dr. Jacobsen. You are free to go. 13 14 Any further witnesses from the defense? 15 MR. WEINERMAN: No, Your Honor. 16 (Defense Rests.) THE COURT: Any rebuttal? 17 18 MR. SINHA: No. Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: Reserving issues around exhibits, both 20 sides have closed their cases, folks. We're going to take a 21 morning break. When you come out, we'll read the legal 22 instructions that apply to the case, and then we will begin our closing arguments. 23 (Jury Out.) 24 25 THE COURT: With regard to Government Exhibit 277, I

Page 1179

have read the proposed exhibit. A lot of it is not relevant. There's a lot of talk of God, repentance, sin, morality. I think the relevant statements, if they are to be considered, consistent -- prior consistent statements of the witness are that he committed sexual, but then BT XXXXXXXXXXX says, "I don't know the story for sure, but I know he had sex with the boy in the center. When I talked with him about this, he cried a lot, and he wanted to commit suicide."

I guess my issue with that is within the context of the statement he says, I don't know for sure. I just know but it doesn't tell you the context, really, of his testimony, which was that he had -- at least one boy had come forward to him to talk about it.

So at this point it seems mostly irrelevant, somewhat confusing with the hearsay nature of the actual statement. And also I would think somewhat cumulative at this point, so I will sustain the objection to 277.

MR. SWEET: Your Honor, just to clarify, if I may, I believe the defense was objecting to just three parts of 277, three small subsections of it. That may change after what the Court just said --

MR. WEINERMAN: It just changed.

THE COURT: I mean, they are objecting to the salient part, which is the actual statements, which I think I have addressed. The rest of it, in my mind, seems

irrelevant.

MR. WEINERMAN: Judge, if this jury reads every page of every exhibit, we will be here until next May, so it's cumulative.

MR. SWEET: To clarify, Your Honor, did the Court mention a part of 277 that the Court was not troubled by? And I would say when Mr. BT X is talking about, "I want to see him repent for his sins and then he can go to haven," is what he wrote. The government did discuss that with BT XXX XXXX, and some of his other things that he wrote.

And the relevance is that Mr. BT X has been accused of doing this to come get a visa, and here he is expressing his love, his concern, his concern for Mr. Johnson's salvation. He expressed a concern for his soul on the stand. And he talks about having confronted Mr. Johnson before.

He talks about I did -- on the very first page, "I did go talk with him" -- well, six lines down, "I have been praying for him for six year and I did go talk with him, but he's still the same. I knew one day this going to happen for him and I did tell him."

So that's going to a prior discussion with -- with Daniel. And it's clear that it's regarding sex, because he discusses -- it's about immoral, God is punishing him. I understand what the Court is saying regarding the uncertainty about the sex with the boy, the suicide, but all this talk

Page 1181

about, "He told me he wants to change but he can't." "Did you have sex with him?" "He try to, but I didn't allow," that's clearly, the last part about having sex with him, is consistent. That's the top of page 3.

And perhaps counsel and I could take one more crack at this, and come down to a stripped-down version that we could try and see if we can reach.

THE COURT: No, I think that's helpful, Mr. Sweet.

I was looking at this just in the context of prior consistent statements, and not -- I didn't have a complete understanding of the context of relevancy that you have just laid out.

So that does make sense to me that the statements that talk about why, his concern for Mr. Johnson, as opposed to his desire to come to the United States would come in.

I still share a concern, and I think these really were the concerns that the defense had about the somewhat vague nature of his knowledge in what other boys may have said.

MR. SWEET: The government is happy to strike that, Your Honor, and I believe that would be December 9, 2013 at 12:07. There are three sections for that.

THE COURT: If you strike those, I will allow 277.

Sorry, Mr. Weinerman, I didn't understand the relevance of the document until Mr. Sweet put it into some context for me.

COURT CLERK: That will be admitted as redacted?

THE COURT: Yes.

(EXHIBIT 277 RECEIVED.)

THE COURT: So in terms of how we want to proceed, it's 10:19, and 10:30 when we bring the jury back out. We can go forward this morning, probably about 15 minutes of instructions. I think the government said they were about 45 minutes.

I guess the question is, do we want to break for an early lunch and do closings completely, following an early lunch, or do we want to get some of it in this morning?

MR. SINHA: The government may be closer to an hour once we put it together.

THE COURT: Still shorter than I thought you would be.

MR. SINHA: Our preference would be to break for lunch, because we're going to try to move the television over so our PowerPoint can be viewed by the jury. So that would be our preference, to do an early lunch.

MR. WEINERMAN: I'm not giving the closing,

Ms. Maxfield is, but it seems it's fairer for there not to be
a break. We should go all the way through, whether we do it
all in the morning or all in the afternoon. That would be
our preference.

THE COURT: So we will instruct them this morning,

and then we will break for an early lunch, and what if we start back up at 12:30?

MR. WEINERMAN: You are just going to instruct.

THE COURT: We're going to instruct. But let's take a short break, and then I will hopefully give the instructions in a clear voice, and we will break when that is done until 12:30.

(Brief recess taken from 10:20 a.m.

to 10:42 a.m.)

MR. WEINERMAN: First thing, I would like to renew the Rule 29 motion, which we have to do after we rest our case.

THE COURT: All right. Consistent with my earlier ruling, I will deny the motion.

MR. WEINERMAN: And then I would like to read into the record -- the government has no objections to any of them, but to make sure they get to the jury. Exhibit 600, Exhibit 602 through 618, so all of those numbers, rather than read each one individually. Exhibits 624, 625, 700, 701-A, 701-B, 709, 710, 711, 713, 716, 717, 720 through 723, and 726 through 729.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MR. WEINERMAN: And the last matter, Judge, I was looking at Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 30(d), which deals with objections to instructions and having to do it out

of the presence of the jury, and out of the jury's hearing.

And requiring us to make specific objections, and the grounds before the jury retires to deliberate.

If it's acceptable to the Court, I would like the record to reflect that the Court has considered our objections previously made, including the ones in the pretrial conference, and that we satisfied the requirement of Rule 30. I have seen some judges, before the jury -- after they are instructed and they hear argument, and before they retire, call us up and ask if there's any exceptions other than previously made. So I want to make sure we had complied with the rule, and are not stuck with plain, narrow review if there's an appeal in the case.

THE COURT: Yes, you complied with the rule, and I think I will tell the jury not to begin deliberations until they are instructed by Ms. Pew to do so, because you are going to have to -- the alternate jurors are going to have to gather up their things and leave while that is happening.

We can put on the record whether there's any additional exceptions, and then Ms. Pew can instruct them to begin their deliberations.

Mr. Sweet.

MR. SWEET: The government's exhibits -- and the government has no objection to the exhibits that the defense read. We went over these last night. I don't recall each

and every number, but we went over them together so we're fine with that. And likewise, the government has filed a third exhibit list which ends with 312, so rather than read those into the record, the government would move to admit -- and I believe there may be a few that Ms. Pew notes that weren't actually admitted, 1 through 312, except the ones that are noted as withdrawn.

We did go over these with the defense yesterday afternoon. We made a few redactions and withdrawals since then, which are reflected in this list. And 312 is the board in the back, which we're going to ask that that go to the jury, as well. So there -- I believe there are no objections to 1 through 312, except the ones that were withdrawn.

THE COURT: We will bring the jury in for instructions.

(JURY IN.)

JURY INSTRUCTIONS

THE COURT: All right. You have heard all the evidence in the case. Thank you, again, on behalf of all the parties, and myself and my staff for all the work you've put into this case. My plan is to give you the instructions this morning. It's going to take some setting up for closing argument, so we're going to break early for lunch and have you back here at 12:30, in which case we will start our

closing arguments. When those are complete, we will then begin the deliberations.

You will have a copy of these instructions with you in the jury room. We will make one for each of you, so do not feel like you have to write down everything I am saying.

It is your duty to weigh and evaluate the evidence received in the case, and in that process, decide the facts. It is also your duty to apply the law as I give it to you, to the facts as you find them, whether or not you agree with the law or not. You must decide the case solely on the evidence and the law. Do not allow personal likes or dislikes, sympathy, prejudice, fear, or public opinion to influence you. You should also not be influenced by any person's race, color, religion, national ancestry or gender, sexual orientation, profession, occupation, celebrity, economic circumstances, or position in life or in the community. You will recall that you took an oath promising to do so at the beginning of the case.

You must follow all of these instructions and not single out some and ignore others. They are all important. Please do not read into these instructions, or into anything I may have said or done, any suggestion as to what verdict you should return -- the matter is entirely up to you.

Because you must base your verdict only on the evidence received in the case and on these instructions, I

Page 1187

remind you that you must not be exposed to any other information about the case or to the issue it involves, except for discussing the case with your fellow jurors during deliberations.

I have given you throughout the trial and in the beginning of the trial, several warnings about not listening to the media, not discussing the matter outside of court, being in a position where you are not overhearing others talk about the case. So I am not going to read to you those instructions again. But I will read -- some of these are repetitious from earlier, but I think they are worth repeating.

The first is, what is evidence? The evidence you are to consider in this case in deciding the facts consists of the sworn testimony of any witness, and exhibits that are received into evidence, any facts to which the parties have agreed, called stipulations, and any facts that the Court has instructed you to accept as true.

So what is not evidence? Reaching your verdict you may consider only those things that are previously listed. The following things are not evidence, and you may not consider them in deciding what the facts are. One, questions, statements, objections and arguments by the lawyers are not evidence. The lawyers are not witnesses. Although you must consider a lawyer's question to understand

the answer of a witness, the lawyer's questions are not evidence.

Similarly, what the lawyers have said or will say in their opening statements -- or said in their opening statements and will say in their closing arguments, and at other times is intended to help you interpret the evidence, but it is not evidence. If the facts, as you remember them, differ from the way the lawyers state them in their arguments, your memory of them controls.

Two, any testimony that I have excluded, stricken or instructed you to disregard is not evidence. Three, anything that you may have seen or heard when court was not in session is not evidence. You are to decide this case solely on the evidence received at the trial.

Direct and circumstantial evidence, there are two types of evidence, direct and circumstantial. Evidence may be direct or circumstantial. Direct evidence is direct proof of a fact, such as the testimony of an eyewitness about what that witness personally saw or heard or did. Circumstantial evidence is indirect evidence, that is it's a proof of one or more facts from which you can find another fact. The proof, sometimes, we would describe it as proof of a chain of facts pointing to the existence or nonexistence of another fact.

You are to consider both direct and circumstantial evidence. Either can be used to prove any fact. The law

Page 1189

makes no distinction between the weight to be given to either direct or circumstantial evidence. It is for you to decide how much weight to give the evidence.

You have watched transcripts and recording -- you have watched recordings that have been received into evidence. Each of you was given a transcript of the recording to help you identify speakers and help you listen to the recording. However, bear in mind that the recording is the evidence, not the transcript. If you heard something different from what appeared in the transcript, what you heard is controlling.

For recordings that involve the translation of a foreign language, such as Khmer, you must accept the English translation as evidence.

Foreign language testimony. You have heard testimony of a witness who testified in the Khmer language. Witnesses who do not speak English, or are more proficient in another language testify through an official interpreter. It says here, although some of you may know the Khmer language -- I don't think we've asked you this. Do any -- is there anybody who actually knows some Khmer language, that you understand some words?

(No Response.)

THE COURT: Well, if you did, it is important that jurors consider the same evidence; therefore, you must accept

Page 1190

the interpreter's translation of the witness' testimony. You must disregard any different meaning.

You must not make assumptions about a witness or a party based solely on the fact that an interpreter was used.

Credibility of witnesses, in deciding this case you may have to decide which testimony to believe and which testimony not to believe. You may believe everything a witness says, part of it, or none of it.

In considering the testimony of any witness, you may take into account, one, the witness' opportunity and ability to see or hear or know the things testified to; two, the witness' memory; three, the witness's manner while testifying; four, the witness's interest in the outcome of the case, if any; five, the witness' bias or prejudice, if any; six, whether other evidence contradicted the witness' testimony; seven, the reasonableness of the witness' testimony in light of all the evidence; eight, the prior statements of the witness; and nine, any other factors that bear on believability.

Sometimes a witness may say something that is not consistent with something else he or she said. Sometimes different witnesses will give different versions of what happened. People often forget things or make mistakes in what they remember. Also, two people may see the same event, but remember it differently. You may consider these

Page 1191

differences, but do not decide the testimony is untrue just because it differs from other testimony.

However, if you decide that a witness has deliberately testified untruthfully about something important, you may choose not to believe everything that witness testified. However, on the other hand, if you think the witness testified untruthfully about some things, but told the truth about others, you may accept the part you think is true, and ignore the rest.

The weight of the evidence as to a fact does not necessarily depend on the number of witnesses who testify. What is important is how believable the witnesses are, and how much weight you think their testimony deserves.

Prior statements of a witness, some witnesses who testified in Court also made statements to others in the past. You may consider the consistency or the inconsistencies of these statements in deciding whether or not to believe a witness, and how much weight to give to the testimony of a witness.

Testimony of witnesses, compensation and benefits.

You have heard testimony from some witnesses who received benefits or compensation from the government in connection with this case. For this reason, in evaluating the testimony of these witnesses, you should consider the extent to which or whether their testimony may have been influenced by the

Page 1192

compensation or benefits. You should examine the testimony of these witnesses with greater caution than that of other witnesses. It is for you to determine the weight to give such evidence.

Opinion evidence, expert witness, you have heard testimony from certain witnesses who testified to opinions and reasons for their opinions. The opinion testimony is allowed because of their education or experience of this witness. Such opinion testimony should be judged like any other testimony. You may accept it or reject it, and give it as much weight as you think it deserves, considering the witness' education and experience, the reasons given for the opinion, and all the other evidence in the case.

Statements made by a defendant, you have heard testimony that Mr. Johnson made certain statements to others. It is for you to decide, one, whether Mr. Johnson made the statement, and two, if so, how much weight to give to it. In making those decisions you should consider all of the evidence about the statement, including the circumstances under which Mr. Johnson may have made it.

Prior proceedings. You have heard testimony that Mr. Johnson was arrested in Cambodia and spent time in jail in Cambodia. You have also heard testimony about a court proceeding in Cambodia. You should not speculate as to the nature or outcome of the proceeding in Cambodia. What a

Page 1193

Cambodian Court did or did not do is not relevant to your deliberations. You should base your verdict only on the evidence you heard in this case.

Charts and summaries and transcripts not admitted into evidence, during the trial certain charts and summaries and transcripts were shown to you in order to help explain the evidence in the case. Some of these charts and summaries and transcripts were not admitted into evidence, and will not go into the jury room with you. They are not themselves evidence or proof of any facts.

If they do not correctly reflect the facts or figures shown by the evidence in the case, you should disregard these charts and summaries and determine the facts from the underlying evidence.

Use of notes, some of you have taken notes during the trial. Whether or not you took notes, you should rely on your own memory of what was said. Notes are only to assist your memory. You should not be overly influenced by your notes, or by the notes of your fellow jurors.

Consideration of punishment, the punishment provided by law for this crime is for the Court to decide. You may not consider punishment in deciding whether the government has proved its case against Mr. Johnson beyond a reasonable doubt.

Stipulations of fact, the parties have agreed to

Page 1194

certain facts that have been stated to you. Those facts are now conclusively established. The Court is instructing you that the following facts are true, and you will have these with you as part of the instructions.

Stipulation No. 1, on January 10, 2014, an APLE, A-P-L-E social worker and an APLE lawyer met with ES XXXXXXXX and SO XXXXXXXX at a shelter in Cambodia. The boys said that Sambo Heng, former staff member from Hope Transition Cambodia met them at their high school a week ago. Sambo said that he visited Daniel Johnson, who was in custody in Cambodia. Sambo said that Daniel was very thin and having a very difficult time, and Sambo felt pity for him.

Both ES XXXX and SO XXX said to the APLE members that their statements about the abuse, by Daniel Johnson, were not true. They did not want to lie to everybody and they did not want someone to be prosecuted because of a lie, and that they would change their statements.

APLE wrote a report regarding their statements on January 11, 2014, and provided the FBI with the report.

Page 1195

ES XXXXXXXX, but had been briefed on the case. To the APLE employee's knowledge, none of the victims had disclosed that Daniel Johnson had taken explicit images of them.

MR. WEINERMAN: Judge, I think there's an error. I think both parties agree. The date should read on January 6, 2014 when the --

THE COURT: All right. We will fix that.

MR. WEINERMAN: Same date. January 6, 2014, not 2013.

MR. SWEET: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: We will make that correction.

Stipulation two, at all relevant times, including between November 1st, 2005, and December 9, 2013, Daniel Johnson's last known domestic residence was in the District of Oregon.

Stipulation No. 3. 1, Mr. Johnson's TECS records, airline records, passport, and US and Cambodian immigration records, including records regarding immigration status, travel, and entry and exit data, and the information contained in those records are true and accurate.

- 2, Mr. Johnson became a United States citizen at birth, and he has remained a United States citizen, continuously and without interruption from the time of his birth to present.
 - 3, Mr. Johnson traveled in interstate and foreign

- 1 | commerce between the United States and Cambodia, between, on,
- 2 or about the following dates: November 28, 2005, departing
- 3 | the US, to December 6, 2005, arriving in Cambodia;
- 4 January 11, 2007, departing the US, January 12th, 2007
- 5 arriving in Cambodia; October 10, 2008, departing the US,
- 6 October 11, 2008, arriving in Cambodia; October 22nd, 2009,
- 7 departing the US, October 23rd, 2009, arriving in Cambodia;
- 8 June 8, 2010, departing US, June 10, 2010, arriving in
- 9 Cambodia; January 18, 2011, departing the US, January 19,
- 10 2011, arriving in Cambodia.
- 4, Mr. Johnson was present within the District of
- 12 Oregon and then traveled in interstate and foreign commerce
- 13 between the United States and Cambodia on or about the
- 14 | following dates: June 21st, 2011, in Oregon, July 5, 2011,
- 15 departed the US, July 7, 2011, arrived in Cambodia;
- 16 December 1st, 2011, in Oregon, December 20th, 2011 departed
- 17 | the US, December 22nd, 2011, arrived in Cambodia; July 24,
- 18 2012, in Oregon, August 24, 2012, departed the US, August 27,
- 19 2012, arrived in Cambodia; November 19, 2012, in Oregon,
- 20 December 5, 2012, departed the US, December 7, 2012, arrived
- 21 | in Cambodia; May 28, 2013, in Oregon, May 29, 2013, departed
- 22 the US, May 30, 2013, arrived in Cambodia.
- 23 Stipulation No. 4, in accordance with Title 28,
- 24 | Section 1821 of the United States Code, any fact witnesses
- 25 | for either party must be paid a \$40 witness fee for each day

Page 1197

they attend the trial, and for each day necessarily occupied in going to and returning from the place of attendance. That same Federal law requires that, in addition to travel-related expenses, fact witnesses must be paid a subsistence allowance. The subsistence allowance paid to any fact witness in the case will be the current Federal per diem rate for Eugene, Oregon of \$59 per day.

Defendant's decision not to testify, a defendant in a criminal case has a Constitutional right not to testify.

In arriving at your verdict, the law prohibits you from considering in any manner that Mr. Johnson did not testify.

Presumption of innocence, burden of proof. The indictment is not evidence. Mr. Johnson has pleaded not guilty to the charges. He's presumed to be innocent unless and until the government proves his guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. Mr. Johnson does not have to testify or present any evidence. He does not have to prove innocence. The government has the burden of proving every element of the charge beyond a reasonable doubt.

Beyond a reasonable doubt, proof beyond a reasonable doubt is proof that leaves you firmly convinced that Mr. Johnson is guilty. It is not required that the government prove guilt beyond all possible doubt.

A reasonable doubt is based on reason and commonsense, and is not based purely on speculation. It may

Page 1198

arise from a careful and impartial consideration of all the evidence, or from a lack of evidence.

If, after careful and impartial consideration of all the evidence, you are not convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that Mr. Johnson is guilty, it is your duty to find him not guilty.

On the other hand, if, after careful and impartial consideration of all the evidence in the case, you are convinced beyond a reasonable doubt that Mr. Johnson is guilty, it is your duty to find him guilty.

Activities not charged, you are here only to determine whether Mr. Johnson is guilty or not guilty of the charges in the indictment. He is not on trial for conduct or offenses not charged in the indictment.

Separate consideration of multiple counts, single defendant. A separate crime is charged against Mr. Johnson in each count. You must decide each count separately. Your verdict on one count should not control your verdict on any other count.

I am now going to go through the different counts of the indictment, and the elements that are required legally to be proven by the government beyond a reasonable doubt.

First, Counts 1 through 6. Mr. Johnson is charged in Counts 1 through 6 of the indictment with traveling in foreign commerce and engaging in illicit sexual conduct in a

Page 1199

foreign place in violation of Section 2423(c) of Title 18 of the United States Code. In order for him to be found guilty of these charges the government must prove each of the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt.

One, that Mr. Johnson is a United States citizen; two, that Mr. Johnson traveled in foreign commerce from the United States to Cambodia; and three, Mr. Johnson engaged in illicit sexual conduct with the victims referenced in that count of the indictment, and it will say, "please see the chart below."

And to clarify, Mr. Johnson engaged in illicit sexual conduct with the victim referenced in that count in the indictment, in Cambodia.

Now, in the instructions you will see Count 1 through 6, the same criminal charge, but it involves six different minor alleged victims. So this chart puts the names and the dates for each of the counts of the indictment.

So you will see Count 1 says Minor Victim No. 1, name BT XXXXXXXXX. Next you will see BT XXXXXXXX, so that you know specifically which of the alleged victims we're talking about.

A person born in the United States is a United States citizen at birth. A United States passport issued by the Secretary of State to a citizen of the United States is proof of United States citizenship for the period during

which the passport is valid.

Lack of consent is not an element of the offense.

The government does not have to prove that the victim did not consent to the illicit sexual conduct, nor is the government required to show that the victim resisted.

The government does not have to prove that the illicit sexual conduct violated the laws of the foreign country where it occurred.

For this offense, the government does not have to prove that Mr. Johnson intended to engage in illicit sexual conduct at the time he departed the United States.

Count 7 of the indictment, Mr. Johnson is charged in Count 7 of the indictment with traveling in foreign commerce for the purpose of engaging in any illicit sexual conduct with a person under 18 years of age in violation of Section 2423(b) of Title 18 of the United States Code. In order for Mr. Johnson to be found guilty of this charge the government most prove each of the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt.

One, that Mr. Johnson is a United States citizen; two, that Mr. Johnson traveled in foreign commerce from the United States on or about June 23rd, 2011, and May 29th, 2013; three, Mr. Johnson traveled for the purpose of engaging in illicit sexual conduct.

Again, a person born in the United States is a

Page 1201

United States citizen at birth. A United States passport issued by the Secretary of State to a citizen of the United States is proof of a United States citizenship for the period during which the passport is valid.

For this offense, the government does not have to prove that Mr. Johnson actually engaged in illicit sexual conduct, but must prove that he travelled for the purpose of engaging in such conduct. In doing so, the government need not prove that Mr. Johnson traveled in foreign commerce for the sole and exclusive purpose of engaging in illicit sexual conduct. A person may have different purposes or motives for travel, and each may prompt in varying degrees the act of making the journey.

For this count, the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that a dominant, significant, or motivating purpose of Mr. Johnson's travel in foreign commerce was to engage in illicit sexual conduct. In other words, the government must prove the sexual act was not merely incidental to travel. The government does not have to prove the illicit sexual conduct is illegal in the country to which Mr. Johnson traveled.

Count 8 of the indictment. Mr. Johnson is charged in Count 8 of traveling across a state line with the intent to engage in a sexual act with a person who was less than 12 years old.

Page 1202

In order for you to find him guilty of this charge the government must prove each of the following elements beyond a reasonable doubt: One, Mr. Johnson traveled across a state line between on or about June 23rd, 2011, and May 29, 2013; and two, Mr. Johnson traveled with the intent to engage in a sexual act with a person who is less than 12 years old.

Again, the government does not have to prove that Mr. Johnson actually engaged in a sexual act with a person under 12, but must prove that he traveled with the intent to engage in such conduct.

In doing so, the government need not prove that Mr. Johnson traveled across a state line for the sole and exclusive purpose of engaging in a sexual act with a person under 12. A person may have different purposes or motives for travel, and each may prompt in varying degrees the act of making the journey.

For this Count, the government must prove beyond a reasonable doubt that a dominant, significant, or motivating purpose of Mr. Johnson's travel across a state line was to engage in a sexual act with a person under 12. In other words, the government must prove the sexual act was not merely incidental to the travel.

Some definitions. The term "illicit sexual conduct" means knowingly engaging in a commercial sex act with a person, the victim, who is under 18 years of age; the

government does not have to prove the defendant knew the victim was under the age of 18.

Or illicit sexual conduct means knowingly causing a person who is under 18 years of age to engage in a sexual act, one, by using force against that person, or two, by threatening or placing that person in fear.

Or the term illicit sexual conduct means knowingly engaging in a sexual act with a person, the victim, who has attained the age of 12 years, but has not attained the age of 16 years, and is at least four years younger than the defendant; the government does not have to prove that the defendant knew the age of the victim, nor does it have to prove the defendant knew the requisite age difference existed.

Illicit sexual conduct also means knowingly engaging in a sexual act with a person, the victim, who is under 12 years of age; the government does not have to prove the defendant knew the victim was under the age of 12.

The term "sexual act" means contact between the penis and the anus, involving penetration, however slight, or contact between the mouth and the penis, or the mouth and the anus, or penetration, however slight, of the anal opening by a hand, finger, or any object, with the attempt to abuse, humiliate, harass, or degrade the person, or to arouse or gratify the sexual desire of the defendant or any other

person.

Or an intentional touching, not through the clothing, of the genitalia of the person younger than 16 years old, with the intent to abuse, humiliate, harass, or degrade the person, or to arouse or gratify the sexual desire of the defendant, or any other person.

The term "commercial sex act" means any sex act, on account of which anything of value is given or received by any person.

The term "travel in foreign commerce" means travel between any part of the United States and a foreign country.

On or about, the indictment charges the offenses alleged occurred on or about a certain date. Although it is necessary for the government to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the offense was committed on a date reasonably near the date alleged in the indictment, it is not necessary for the government to prove that the offense was committed precisely on the date charged.

Venue, Counts 1 through 6, for the offenses charged in Counts 1 through 6, the government must prove it is more likely true than not that Mr. Johnson was first brought to or arrested in the District of Oregon, or that his last known residence was in the District of Oregon. You decide these facts by considering all the evidence and deciding what evidence is more believable. This is a lower standard of

Page 1205

proof than beyond a reasonable doubt. The requirement of proof beyond a reasonable doubt applies to all other issues in this case.

Counts 7 and 8, for the offenses charged in Counts 7 and 8, the government must prove it is more likely true than not true that the offense was begun, continued, or completed in the District of Oregon. You decide these facts by considering all the evidence and deciding what evidence is more believable. This is a lower standard of proof than proof beyond a reasonable doubt. The requirement of proof beyond a reasonable doubt applies to all other issues in this case.

The word "knowingly," an act is done knowingly if the defendant is aware of the act and does not act through ignorance, mistake, or accident. The government is not required to prove the defendant knew that his acts or omissions were unlawful. You may consider evidence of the defendant's words, acts, or omissions, along with all other evidence, in deciding whether the defendant acted knowingly.

Unanimous agreement, with regard to Count 7 the parties have stipulated that during the time frame set forth in Count 7, Mr. Johnson took five trips from the United States to Cambodia. While you may consider all of these trips in your deliberations, you may only find Mr. Johnson guilty of Count 7 if you all unanimously agree beyond a

Page 1206

reasonable doubt, one, that Mr. Johnson possessed the requisite intent for a specified United States to Cambodia trip, and two, that Mr. Johnson was a US citizen at the time of the trip. You must unanimously agree on at least one trip.

In other words, six of you can't agree that something occurred during trip two, and 6 of you say, no, but we think it occurred during trip three. 12 of you have to agree on a single trip.

Count 8, the parties have stipulated that during the time frame set forth in Count 8, Mr. Johnson took five trips from the United States, to Cambodia. While you may consider all of these trips in your deliberations, you may only find Mr. Johnson guilty of Count 8 if you all unanimously agree beyond a reasonable doubt as to a specific trip in which he crossed a state line with the requisite intent. You must unanimously agree on at least one trip.

You have a verdict form that has been prepared for you. After you reach a unanimous agreement on a verdict, your presiding juror, foreperson, should complete the form according to deliberations and sign it and date it, and advise the clerk that you are ready to return to the courtroom.

I will give you further instructions about deliberations, brief instructions, after the closing

Page 1207

statements. Because the attorneys will likely reference the verdict form, I think what we will do is give you a copy of the verdict form to have with you to reference during the closing statements, so that the attorneys can express to you their arguments about how you should go about filling out the verdict form. So you will have a copy during closing statements, and then of course you will take a copy back with you.

So our plan now is to break for lunch until 12:30. At 12:30 the government will begin their closing statement. Remember, the government has the complete burden of proof here. So they will go first, followed by the defense, and because the government has the burden of proof, they will have an opportunity to provide rebuttal argument.

We will then say goodbye to our alternate jurors, and the 12 jurors will be able to begin their deliberations. So with that, we will break for lunch and see you back here at 12:30.

(JURY OUT.)

THE COURT: Please be seated. Mr. Weinerman, since I just gave the instructions and we don't have the jury deliberating until later this afternoon, now is as good a time as any to make any exceptions to the record.

MR. WEINERMAN: Yes, Judge, and I am going to mention a few. That doesn't mean we don't continue our

exception to the remainder.

We still believe the Court should identify an alleged victim in Count 7 and 8. The Court has done so in Counts 1 through 6, but not 7 and 8. And here I know the Court has redenied that, but we wanted to renew that request.

And we previously submitted our instruction on Counts 1 through 6, the elements of the offense. I think we did at the pretrial conference. I don't have the document in front of me, and the Court denied. But we're renewing that request to renew the instruction on Counts 1 through 6.

THE COURT: Thank you.

For the record, any exceptions from the government?

MR. SWEET: No exceptions. Just one error that I believe we made on page 27. There's, for Count 1 there's an extra zero in November 12, 2008. It's 20,008 right now. That's the only thing. Thank you.

THE COURT: We will fix that. There are a couple of other minor typos that we will go through.

See everybody back at 12:30, and if you need to stay and set up for your closing statements, please do so.

(Lunch recess taken from 11:25 a.m.

to 12:39 p.m.)

THE COURT: All right. Ready to go? Bring the jury in. This would be a good time to remind people to turn their phones down or off. I am usually the worst when it comes to

that.

(JURY IN.)

THE COURT: Please be seated. Mr. Allnatt is handing out a copy of the verdict form so you have some sense of the questions you are going to be asked to answer. With that, we will hear closing summation from the government.

Mr. Sinha.

GOVERNMENT'S CLOSING ARGUMENT

MR. SINHA: Control and abuse. At the beginning of this trial, the United States, Ms. Britsch, stood up here and told you that this is a case about control and abuse. And over the last two-and-a-half weeks of testimony, what seemed like a lifetime, you have heard testimony from 13 Cambodian witnesses and 10 Americans. And together, they have painted a portrait of control and abuse.

They have painted a harrowing and horrifying portrait of what life was like for the boys who lived at the Hope Transition Center under the control of Daniel Johnson. That portrait has included being in fear, being threatened, being hit. That portrait has included being systematically and repeatedly sexually abused by Daniel Johnson whenever he wanted.

Now, you have heard extensive testimony from boy after boy after boy after boy about the things that

Page 1210

Daniel Johnson did to them, and the things that Daniel Johnson attempted to do to them. But I want to focus your attention on six of them today. These are the six children whose abuse underlies Count 1 through 6 of the indictment. These are the six children who are going to ask you to

consider the evidence about their abuse.

The first, underlying Count 1 is BT XX. Two, Count 2 is ES XXX, or sometimes called "ES XXX." 3, Count 3 is LS XXXXX. 4, Count 4 is SO XXX. 5, Count 5 is VS XXXX, or VS XXXX. And 6, Count 6 is CC X, or CC XXXXXX.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, you sat through this trial and you have watched these kids testify. And though they spoke through interpreters, you don't have to speak a foreign language to understand what they were telling you. You don't have to speak Khmer to hear the pain in their voice, to see the shame on their faces, to see the scars that they still bear from the things that Daniel Johnson did to them.

Ladies and gentlemen, you don't have to speak Khmer to see the tears that some of them had. And when you saw that, you can make a determination that when they told you about the ways in which Daniel Johnson repeatedly and systematically sexually abused them, they were speaking from the heart.

Now, you also heard from several other boys who

Page 1211

lived at Hope Transition Center, boys who Daniel Johnson also controlled, and either attempted or succeeded in sexually abusing. Now, those are boys who told you about their experiences themselves, but they also told you what they saw. And they provided you with important context and corroboration of the things that Mr. Johnson did to those six victims.

Some of the details that those boys told you are difficult to forget. You may recall SESX talking to you about how Mr. Johnson attempted to touch his genitals whenever he gave him a massage. And SESX expressed his love for Mr. Johnson, saying if he keeps continuing to do that to me, I am going to stop giving him a massage.

You heard RT XX talk about Mr. Johnson trying to grab his penis, and from LT XXXXXXX who actually left the orphanage and had to leave his little brother behind, because Mr. Johnson repeatedly grabbed his penis.

You may also remember LT XXXXXXXX telling you what LS X told him about Mr. Johnson. In strikingly similar language to what LS X told you from the stand, LS X told LT XXXXXXXX quote, "He sucked my dick."

You heard from SS XX, and at first how SS XX -- how Mr. Johnson tried to grab SS XX's genitals, and second, how SO XXX disclosed the abuse that Mr. Johnson had put upon him, and the sexual abuse that Mr. Johnson had committed against

Page 1212

SO XXX, disclosed it to SS XX. But perhaps most strikingly from SS XX, you heard his testimony that was corroborated by SESX.

That at night Mr. Johnson would come into the room where the boys were sleeping with a flashlight, and he would walk around and choose which of the boys he was going to pick up and carry into his bedroom, and that he often chose SO XXX, LT XXXXXXX, and ES XXX. As SS XX put it, at times they were asleep and he came and just took them.

In addition to the boys at Hope Transition Center, you also heard from a number of volunteers. First, you heard from Celena Ocen who told a story of volunteering and being there on the morning of Mr. Johnson's arrest.

She told you that she went to worship services at 5:00 a.m., and after she got done and took a shower, she was outside Mr. Johnson's bedroom for about four hours. No one came in, and no one went out. And in spite of her repeated knocking at the door, Mr. Johnson didn't answer.

Celena then told you she saw a boy emerge from that room looking disheveled, I believe she said looking intoxicated. And that Mr. Johnson came out later tucking in his shirt.

You also heard from Kelby and Lindsay Alderson.

Kelby and Lindsay told you about the times that SO XXX and

CC X had told them about Mr. Johnson's sexual abuse of them.

Page 1213

But Lindsay sat up here, and with tears welling in her eyes, recounted to you how SO XXX told her that one time he pretended to be asleep while another boy was being abused so that Mr. Johnson wouldn't abuse him.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is a difficult case to serve on. I have little doubt that you have heard things you never wanted to hear, and we have asked you to consider in depth things that I suspect you never want to think about. And frankly, I have no illusion about the cost of your service on this jury to you. The sleepless nights it may have caused, the sleepless nights it may cause you.

But the United States can't apologize for the evidence you have heard. The United States didn't create this evidence. Mr. Johnson created the evidence you heard, and it's evidence of his control and abuse of these children.

So let's talk about that evidence, and let's talk about how it fits into the charges against Mr. Johnson. While I talk I want to remind you of three things: First and foremost, what I tell you, what Ms. Maxfield tells you, or what Mr. Sweet tells you is not evidence.

The evidence is the testimony you heard, what you saw with your eyes, the exhibits that have been admitted, and the agreed-upon facts. I also want to tell you that while we're going to talk about the law, and I am going to try to give you an insight into how the government views the case,

what I tell you is not the law. If there's any conflict, refer to the jury instructions.

And finally, I want to remind you that at all points the United States bears the burden of proving each element of these crimes. With those three things in mind, let's talk about the evidence. The evidence has shown that Mr. Johnson repeatedly and systematically sexually abused multiple boys under the age of 16, and in one case, under the age of 12, who lived at Hope Transition Center. These boys, who were as young as seven years old when Mr. Johnson started molesting them, have told you of the fear they lived in.

Not only has VS XXXX said, the fear that he would continue to violate them, but also the fear that the orphanage would close if they said anything, that they wouldn't be able to seek their education, that their source of food and shelter would go away, that Mr. Johnson would hit them.

And they told you, as ES XXX said, that it really made little difference if they tried to resist, he would do it anyway. They also told you about the commercial nature of Mr. Johnson's sexual abuse. They told you that after the abuse, in many instances, Mr. Johnson gave them money, or gave them cookies. They knew that they were living in the orphanage and receiving the food and shelter and schooling that they were receiving was a condition upon them not

Page 1215

speaking out to the police. They told you how reliant they were on Mr. Johnson. And how sometimes they would get gifts if they submitted to the abuse.

Now, for all of this, Daniel Johnson stands accused of eight Federal crimes. So let's talk about them in order. The first six crimes are all charged under the same statute, so they all have the same elements. So I am going to talk about them together, and then we will break them up.

Counts 1 through 6 of the indictment charge

Mr. Johnson with traveling in foreign commerce and engaging
in illicit sexual conduct. So the first things to consider
in Counts 1 through 6 is whether there is venue for these
charges, and I think this is an easy question for you. There
are two situations in which each of those counts can be
venued in the District of Oregon.

One is that Mr. Johnson was first brought or arrested into the District of Oregon, and two, is that his last known residence was in the District of Oregon. So in terms of him first being brought, you have Exhibit 221 and you have testimony from Special Agent Forrest Schoening who told you that Mr. Johnson was first brought and touched down in America in Portland, Oregon.

That's borne out by 221, which shows his itinerary going from Phnom Penh to Seoul, Seoul to Vancouver, Canada, and then into Portland. So that aspect of the venue would be

sufficient.

But even if you didn't find that aspect of venue, you have the second option, which is that Mr. Johnson's last known residence was in the district of Oregon. The stipulation states that at all relevant times, Mr. Johnson's last known residence was in the District of Oregon.

So let's go to the next element. Once you have established venue, you have to find three elements in order to find Mr. Johnson guilty of any of these charges. First element is that Mr. Johnson was a United States citizen. This also is an easy lift. Mr. Johnson and the United States have agreed that Mr. Johnson has, his entire life, continuously been a United States citizen. Those are stipulated facts.

You could also, if you wanted to, rely on Mr. Johnson's passports, which are admitted into evidence, Mr. Johnson's passport application and other evidence. But you don't need to.

The second element is that Mr. Johnson traveled in foreign commerce from the United States to Cambodia. Now you have an instruction on what that means, but this also is a pretty easy lift for you, because the parties have stipulated that Mr. Johnson traveled in interstate and foreign commerce between the United States and Cambodia, and then it gives you the dates on which he traveled. This is in part three, and I

believe there's a second part, as well.

But in total, you are going to be looking at ten trips in which the parties have agreed that Mr. Johnson traveled between the United States and Cambodia.

Turning to the third element, the third element is that Mr. Johnson engaged in illicit sexual conduct with the victim referenced in the count of the indictment. And like I say, we will go through each of these counts individually. So what does illicit sexual conduct mean? Well, it's got a few definitions. You could find any of these in finding that there's illicit sexual conduct.

So the first one is that Mr. Johnson knowingly engaged in a commercial sex act with someone under the age of 18 years. So I will note for you that a commercial sex act means any act on account of which anything of value is given, or received by the person. So that doesn't mean that is confined to instances in which Mr. Johnson gave someone money. It could be he gave them, for instance, food or gifts or he provided something to them, such as shelter or housing or schooling.

Alternatively, you could find that Mr. Johnson engaged in illicit sexual conduct by finding he knowingly caused a person who is under the age of 18 to engage in a sex act by either using force against that person, or by threatening or placing that person in fear. Here again,

Page 1218

either one works, and there's been testimony, I believe, with regards to both.

There are two other ways to find illicit sexual conduct. One is when there is a gap in age between the person who is perpetrating the crime and the victim.

Actually, that one involves a victim who is under the age of 16 years old, but is over the age of 12, where the defendant -- excuse me, where the perpetrator is over four years older. So here, you have victims who are under the age of 16, but over the age of 12, and as has been testified to, Mr. Johnson is, as we sit here, 40 years old.

So you can look at the dates on which the kids were born, and look at the dates in the indictment, and you can determine that Mr. Johnson was never within four years of these kids.

Finally, for victims who were under 12 years old, you can simply find, regardless of what the gap in age between the victim and the perpetrator is, that the victim was under 12 years old, and that Mr. Johnson knowingly engaged in a sex act with this person.

So let's talk about what constitutes a sex act.

There are several things that constitute a sex act. First, contact between the penis and anus, involving penetration, however slight. You have heard testimony about anal penetration by Mr. Johnson of his victims. And several of

Page 1219

them talked to you about how it was painful. A couple of them talked about how he used lubricant.

Contact between the mouth and the penis, or the mouth and the anus. Here again, you have heard testimony over and over and over again about Mr. Johnson either performing oral sex on these children, making the children perform oral sex on him, attempting to make them perform oral sex on him, or some variation of those three things.

Next, penetration, however slight, of another person's anal opening by hand, finger, or any object with an intent to abuse, humiliate, harass, degrade the person. Or an intent -- and this is the one that seems applicable here, to arouse or gratify the sexual desire of the defendant, or of any person. So if you find there is penetration, however slight, of the anus, and you find that Mr. Johnson was doing so to fulfill his own sexual desire or to gratify or arouse his own sexual desire, that's illicit sexual conduct.

Finally, the intentional touching, not through the clothing, of the genitalia of a person younger than 16 years old. Again, with the same intent. And the one I want to draw your attention to is at the end, with the intent to arouse or gratify the sexual desire of the defendant, or any other person.

Now, here in this case you have heard testimony over and over again about Mr. Johnson touching these

Page 1220

boys' penises, and about Mr. Johnson making them touch his penis. And what you have heard asked almost always after that testimony was, was that skin on skin contact. Was that over your clothes or under the clothes? And the boys in the charged counts have testified to you that that was skin on skin contact. That was not through the clothing. So finding that, you can find illicit sexual conduct, sexual contact, and you can find a sex act.

So let's break up the counts and talk about them individually. Count 1 involves BT XXXXXXXXX, who you have heard referred to throughout sometimes as BT XX. BT XX was born in 1991. As he testified, Mr. Johnson began abusing him when BT XX was 14 or 15 years old. And that abuse continued at Hope Transition Center at three different locations until BT XX was almost 18 years old.

BT XX told you that Mr. Johnson sexually abused him in a variety of ways 19 to 22 times. He told you that Daniel Johnson provided him with money for BT XX's sick dad, and for BT XX's schooling. BT XX told you that he was afraid during the abuse, and that Daniel Johnson would later apologize to him, cite scripture seeking forgiveness, and said he was abusing BT XX because he had been abused. Daniel Johnson reminded BT XX that Daniel Johnson knew people in high places.

Now, the illicit sexual conduct that Daniel Johnson

Page 1221

engaged in with BT XX included skin on skin contact, between Mr. Johnson and BT XX's penises. Oral sex, BT XX told you that Daniel Johnson performed oral sex on him many times, attempted to make BT XX perform oral sex on Mr. Johnson, and attempted anal sex where Daniel Johnson put lubricant on BT XX's anus and attempted to have anal sex with him. He eventually gave up, and as BT XX told you, he then tried to put his penis in BT XX's mouth.

BT XX told you in describing this event, "So he sucked me in that house, and then after he tried to -- and then after that, he tried to put his penis in my butt. But I tried to avoid. I tried to stop him from doing that. Then after that, he also tried to put it in my mouth again."

Count 2, Count 2 involves ES XXXXXXXX, who you have heard referred to as both ES XXX and "ES XXX." ES XXX was born in 1997, and he was 13 years old when he moved to Hope Transition Center. He lived there from 2009 until the date of Daniel's arrest on May 9, 2013.

Though ES XXX told you that he was abused less than three times per week during this period, he told you that the abuse happened pretty much the entire time he lived there. It started almost immediately after he got there, and it only ended a couple of weeks before Daniel was arrested after he told Pastor Sopheak. ES XXX talked to you about how he tried to resist and how he couldn't try to resist more.

Page 1222

And he told you a couple things. He said, "I mean, we had done this since we were young, so even when you refused it didn't do you any good. Why continue to refuse?" And then the question was asked, "What happened when you refused?" And ES XXX's answer was, "He continued to do it. Like yanking on your arms or shoulders."

Now, ES XXX talked to you about a variety of abuse. He talked to you about Daniel Johnson touching his penis, skin on skin. He talked to you about Daniel Johnson making him touch Daniel Johnson's penis. He talked to you about Daniel Johnson performing oral sex on him, and he talked to you about Daniel Johnson touching his penis to ES XXX's mouth.

ES XXX also talked to you about Daniel Johnson's attempted anal sex with him. And he said, as others said, that it was, quote, painful. And in explaining why it wasn't possible for Daniel Johnson to have anal sex with him, he said it was impossible because he was an adult and I was a child.

Count 3, Count 3 involves LS XXXXX. He's largely been referred to as LS X, but occasionally LS X. LS X lived at Hope Transition Center from 2009 until the date of Daniel's arrest in 2013. LS X told you he was born in 2002. So he was seven years old when he moved to Hope Transition Center. And he lived there from the time he was seven until

11, when Daniel was arrested.

LS X told you that Daniel abused him three or four times a week, the entire time he was at Hope Transition Center, with the exception of about two weeks from his arrival date, and two to three weeks before Daniel's arrest on December 9th.

So the entire time that LS X was there, Daniel
Johnson was sexually abusing him. And LS X's age during that
time was age 7 to 11 years old. LS X told you that among the
things that Daniel Johnson did to him was Daniel touched and
masturbated LS X's penis. Daniel made LS X touch and
masturbate Daniel's penis. Daniel performed oral sex on
LS X, and tried to make LS X perform oral sex on him.

LS X told you about the, quote, countless times that Daniel's penis came in contact with LS X's buttocks. And he told you about one instance in which Daniel Johnson tried to anally penetrate him, but ultimately gave up. LS X told you about that time, and he told you how painful it was for him.

LS X also told you that during this period, Daniel Johnson, while touching him, would also touch himself. And LS X gave you a series of details that someone that age usually wouldn't give about Daniel Johnson ejaculating on him, ejaculating on a mattress, ejaculating on Daniel Johnson's own stomach while these things were happening.

Count 4, Count 4 involves SO XXXXXXX. You have

Page 1224

heard him referred to as SO XXX. SO XXX was between the ages of 12 and 16 years old during the time he lived at Hope Transition Center and was being abused by Daniel Johnson. He told you that Daniel Johnson sexually abused him two to three times per month. That the abuse lasted for a span of two to three years, and that he was abused by Daniel Johnson at all three Hope Transition Center locations. SO XXX told you that right after the abuse, Daniel gave SO XXX money. He gave him ice cream, gave him candy, he gave him cookies while SO XXX was still in Daniel's bedroom.

SO XXX told you that Daniel Johnson slapped him and hit him with a belt, and that Daniel Johnson threatened to call the police on him. Daniel Johnson abused SO XXX in a variety of ways similar to the other boys.

Daniel Johnson touched SO XXX's penis. SO XXX told you he ejaculated. Daniel Johnson performed oral sex on SO XXX, and he attempted, like others, to have anal sex with SO XXX. SO XXX told you that he avoided it, that he tried to avoid it by twisting his body away from Daniel, but that it was ultimately painful.

SO XXX also told you why he didn't come forward with the disclosure of the abuse. He said of Daniel Johnson, "I also feel sorry for him and I wanted him to come out and I wanted him -- and he wanted to. Well, he helped a lot of other children, and I want him to continue to help children.

And that's why I couldn't tell the truth."

SO XXX and others talked about the very mixed feelings they had about Daniel. On the one hand, he provided them with their sole source of food and shelter and schooling. And on the other hand, as they told you, time and time again, he used that power to control them and sexually abuse them.

That was equally true for VS XXXX, who underlies Count 5. VS XXXX lived at Hope Transition Center for two years before Daniel was arrested. During that period VS XXXX was ages 11 to 13 years old. VS XXXX told you for that whole period, so from before he was 12, Daniel Johnson was, in VS XXXX's words, violating him at Hope Transition Center. He was sexually abusing him.

And as VS XXXX told you very much like LS X told you, Daniel Johnson would give him money or cookies after the abuse, and VS XXXX and LS X understood it to be payment for the abuse. They understood it to be as a result of the abuse. When asked whether VS XXXX was scared of Daniel, VS XXXX told you, I was afraid he would continue to violate me.

Now, VS XXXX detailed the abuse that he endured. He told you about the first time that Daniel Johnson abused him. He and LS X were in Daniel Johnson's bedroom watching TV. LS X fell asleep, and afterwards, Daniel Johnson made VS XXXX

Page 1226

perform oral sex on him. He did that many, many times.

VS XXXX told you how Daniel Johnson pushed his head down when making him perform oral sex, and told you how Daniel Johnson came.

VS XXXX also told you about the two or three times that Daniel Johnson anally penetrated him. He told you that it was painful. He told you that Daniel Johnson used lubricant, and he told you that he couldn't stop Daniel Johnson because Daniel Johnson was much bigger than VS XXXX.

Count 6, Count 6 involves CC XXXXXX, who is often referred to as CC X. CC X was between the ages of 12 and 15 years old while he lived at Hope Transition Center. He was 15 when Daniel was arrested. As CC X told you, Daniel Johnson sexually abused CC X in very familiar ways. And afterwards he gave CC X money and gifts right after it happened.

CC X told you that he was ashamed. In fact, when asked, "Before Daniel Johnson was arrested, did you ever tell anyone what Daniel was doing to you?" And CC X said, "No." When asked, "Why not?" He said a single word: "Ashamed."

Daniel Johnson's sexual abuse of CC X included skin on skin touching where Daniel Johnson made CC X touch Daniel Johnson's penis. It included oral sex where Daniel Johnson put his penis in CC X's mouth, and when Daniel Johnson ejaculated. And it included anal sex where, as CC X told

Page 1227

you, Daniel Johnson put lotion on his penis first, and then painfully penetrated $CC\ X$.

Count 7 and 8 have different charges. They involve traveling, either across a country line or across a state line with an intent. So let's talk about them each in order.

With Counts 7 and 8 you have a different venue requirement, so let's talk about that first. For Counts 7 and 8 the government has to prove that it is more likely than not that the offense was begun, continued, or completed in the District of Oregon. There's a couple of things you can look for in finding this venue requirement is satisfied.

First, you can look to the parties' stipulation, and the stipulated fact that everyone has agreed on. These facts show you the date on which Daniel Johnson was in Oregon, then departed the United States and traveled to Cambodia.

And if you look at these dates and overlay them with the dates of the abuse, you will see that during this period Mr. Johnson was doing exactly what it seems like he was doing. He was abusing these kids in Cambodia, systematically and repeatedly, several children. He was coming back to the United States, and as Lindsay Alderson told you, raising money to fund the orphanage and then he was turning around and going back to Cambodia.

And on each of those trips to the United States

Mr. Johnson hit destinations all around the country, but each

Page 1228

one he came to Oregon. So the venue statute requires that the offense was begun, completed, or continued in or through Oregon. And that's the basis for you finding venue.

In addition to the travel stipulation, you also have in Exhibits 307 through 311, Mr. Johnson's IP and message records from his Facebook. So you can go through these carefully if you would like. What they will show is Mr. Johnson did exactly what I just described to you. He was in Cambodia abusing these kids. He came back to the United States to raise money. He hit a bunch of churches around the country, one of the places he stopped was in Oregon, and then he turned around and went back to Cambodia. He always intended to go back, and he always did factually go back to Cambodia.

Once you find venue, that it was more likely than not that there was venue, you can turn to Count 7 and we can look at the elements of that charge. Count 7 charges

Mr. Johnson with traveling in foreign commerce with the intent to engage in illicit sexual conduct.

So there's three elements here, and we will talk about each in turn. First is that Mr. Johnson is an American citizen. So we have talked about this. You have a passport and a stipulation that says he has always been an American citizen. Second, is that Mr. Johnson traveled in foreign commerce from the United States to Cambodia.

Page 1229

Now, there's ample evidence of the time that Mr. Johnson was in Cambodia, but we also have a stipulation. And the stipulation tells you that on these dates, dates within the period indicted in Count 7, Mr. Johnson traveled from the United States to Cambodia, back and forth, back and forth, raising money here, and sexually abusing kids there.

Finally, the third element requires for you to find that Mr. Johnson traveled to Cambodia for the purpose of engaging in illicit sexual conduct. So let's talk about that. As the Court instructed you, there's law on how you figure out whether there was a purpose for which Mr. Johnson was traveling. So let's talk about what that law is.

In order to find that Mr. Johnson is guilty of Count 7, you have to find that a dominant, significant, or motivating purpose of his travel back to the orphanage in Cambodia to run it and to sexually abuse these children was to engage in illicit sexual conduct. You have to find, in other words, that his travel from the United States was not -- excuse me, that his intent or desire to sexually abuse these kids was not just incidental to his travel.

Now, in finding that it's a dominant, significant, or motivating purpose, you don't have to find that it was the only purpose. A person can have a variety of purposes while they are traveling. It just has to have been a significant one.

Page 1230

So you have to think about the evidence and use your commonsense and ask yourself, how big of a role do you think it played for Mr. Johnson, that waiting for him in Cambodia he had a stable of children who he could sexually abuse whenever he wanted, however he wanted, for as long as he wanted? How big of a role do you think it played for Mr. Johnson when he was deciding whether to stay in America or go back to that orphanage in Cambodia, do you think it played that those kids were scared of him, and they were scared of losing their home, and they were scared of resisting him. And they were scared of getting in trouble, so he could do whatever he wanted with them.

Do you think that that was incidental to Mr. Johnson's travel to go back to Cambodia and run an orphanage that was predominantly boys, and included several boys who he was sexually abusing on a regular basis?

Count 8, Count 8 is in many ways very similar to Count 7. There's a couple of differences. Count 8 has two elements. The first of which is that Mr. Johnson traveled across a state line -- didn't travel internationally, just traveled across a state line, between the dates in the indictment.

Here again, this is pretty easy, because you have to -- the parties have agreed that Mr. Johnson was in Oregon on these days, which are included in the indicted period, and

Page 1231

that he left, not only Oregon, he left the United States and traveled to Cambodia. So in order to leave the United States you have to cross the Oregon state line. You don't have to spend a ton of time on that one.

The second element is similar to what we just talked about. You need to look at what Mr. Johnson's intent was when he crossed that state line. And again, you need to find that it was a dominant, significant, or motivating purpose; that it wasn't merely incidental that he engaged in a sex act with a child under the age of 12.

Now, you can match up the dates, but I will tell you what two children you should focus on. LS XXXXX was abused during the entire period that he was at Hope Transition Center up to Mr. Johnson's arrest. And at no point during that period was he ever over the age of 12. You have heard testimony and you have seen evidence, including LS X's passport, that tells you that on the day of Mr. Johnson's arrest, he was 11 years old.

The other kid you can look at in considering this charge -- well, you can just look at LS X. That's all for now.

Now, you have heard a lot of testimony from these boys, and you have heard a lot of testimony from other boys who were abused, or who Mr. Johnson intended to abuse. And it seems that over the course of this trial you have heard

Page 1232

day after day after day after day of people corroborating the boys' testimony, of the boys corroborating one another's testimony, of evidence that corroborates the boys' testimony.

So while I will not go over all of the pieces of corroboration that you have heard, I will remind you of 30 of them, so let's go through those. For Count 1 involving BT XX XXXX, you heard testimony that right after the arrest BT XXX XXXX told a woman, Knot, that Daniel had abused him, and he tried to have sex with him. You also heard in early 2014 BT XX confided in Kelby Alderson, telling Kelby that it was true Daniel had sexually abused him.

You also heard testimony from Lindsay Alderson, telling you that in early 2014 BT XX told her that the accusations of sexual molestation against Daniel were true. And finally, you heard about the 2014 child forensic interview conducted by Martha Finnegan, who is a forensic interviewer for the FBI, in which BT XX talked to her about the abuse.

For Count 2, ES XXX, you heard testimony from Tola telling you that he saw ES XXX sleeping in Daniel Johnson's room at the third house in Hope Transition Center. You heard testimony from Pastor Sopheak saying approximately two or three weeks, ES XXX and LS X came to him and told him that Daniel was sexually abusing them.

You heard testimony from SESX, who told you that at

Page 1233

the first or second house for Hope Transition Center, ES XXX had told him that Daniel had played with his penis and sucked his penis. You heard testimony from BT XX who told you that before he moved to the United States, he had spoken to ES XXX and ES XXX had told him what Daniel had did to him, quote, just like husband and wife. And finally, you heard part of ES XXX's forensic interview with the FBI from 2017.

Count 3, LS X, for LS X, you also heard testimony from Tola who told you that at the third house he overheard LS X tell his friends that Daniel had touched his penis. You heard from Pastor Sopheak who, like ES XXX, told you about two to three weeks before Daniel's arrest LS X and ES XXX had told him that Daniel was abusing them.

You heard testimony from ES XXX who told you that his younger brother had told him that Daniel was abusing him. You heard testimony from LT XXXXXXXX, who told you that LS X had told him that Daniel had touched his penis, and also had told him that Daniel had sucked his penis.

You heard testimony regarding LS X's disclosure on the date of arrest by the Cambodian National Police, and what he told them. And that he told you that he had, quote, sparingly told them, end quote, what Daniel had been doing, he told you that he had disclosed the abuse that was taking place.

LS X also told you that when it came time for

Page 1234

Daniel's trial in Cambodia, he stood up and he told them about Daniel abusing him. Finally, you heard part of LS X's forensic interview with FBI forensic interviewer Martha Finnegan that took place in 2014.

For SO XXX you heard BT XX testify that SO XXX had told him that Daniel was abusing him before BT XX moved to the United States. You heard Pastor Sopheak tell you that SO XXX had told him that Daniel was sexually abusing him, and told him that Daniel had played with his penis and that Daniel had had sex with SO XXX, but that Daniel pulled his penis out of SO XXX's anus because it was hurting SO XXX.

You heard from SESX who told you that at the second or third house, SO XXX told him that Daniel had been with him in a sexual way. You heard from SS XX who told you that the -- who told you that before the arrest, LS X had told him that he and Daniel had slept together and done sexual things.

You heard from Lindsay Alderson who told you about SO XXX telling her that the sexual allegations against Daniel were true, and that Daniel had done those things to SO XXX. You heard from Kelby Alderson who told you basically the same thing. And you heard about the 2016 forensics interview in which SO XXX disclosed abuse to the FBI.

For VS XXXX, you heard that VS XXXX testified and talked about the abuse at the Cambodian trial. And you heard that VS XXXX had talked to FBI interviewer Martha and told

Page 1235

her about the uncomfortable things that Daniel had done to him.

Finally for Count 6, you heard from Lindsay Alderson that CC X, who is the subject of Count 6, told her that Daniel would call him into his room, touch him in an area, and at that point he pointed to his genitals. You heard from Kelby Alderson who told him the same thing.

You heard that CC X told the Cambodian National Police that Daniel had touched his sex organ, and you heard about CC X's interviews in 2014 and 2017 with the FBI forensic interviewers in which he told them that Daniel had touched his penis, and told the second one about all the things that Daniel had done to him.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, in addition to all of this corroboration, I want to highlight two more things. First, you heard testimony from three witnesses, Pastor Sopheak, ES XXX and LS X about ES XXX and LS X telling Pastor Sopheak, before Daniel's arrest, before the involvement of any law enforcement, before any interviews, telling Pastor Sopheak that Daniel was abusing them.

And you heard testimony from ES XXX and Pastor
Sopheak about Pastor Sopheak confronting Daniel about two or
three weeks before Daniel's arrest. You also heard testimony
from ES XXX and LS X that after Pastor Sopheak confronted
him, the abuse stopped up until the time of Daniel's arrest.

Page 1236

And you have heard testimony regarding Facebook messages that Pastor Sopheak sent and received prior to the confrontation with Daniel, and after that confrontation.

You have also heard testimony and seen evidence of another confrontation in which BT XX spoke to Daniel, and Daniel explained that "I have done nothing in the United States and I have done nothing in Vietnam." But notably absent from Daniel Johnson's denials to BT XX was "I have done nothing in Cambodia."

In addition to the evidence of Daniel Johnson's repeated abuse of all these boys, you have also learned of the years that Daniel Johnson spent frightening, intimidating, and most of all controlling them. You have heard about his efforts to control them before he was arrested, but you have also heard about how those efforts continued after the arrest.

And they give you some insight into why the boys haven't always disclosed abuse to everyone they spoke to. You heard testimony from SO XXX and ES XXX regarding their recantation, and from ES XXX about Daniel telling him to tell his younger brother LS X to lie.

You heard testimony from LT XXXXXXX about him visiting Daniel in jail. Daniel apologizing to him, and telling him, Don't say anything to the FBI. You have seen Facebook messages between Daniel's brother Gary and Pastor

Page 1237

Sinai talking about perhaps giving 10K to BT XX to change his story.

And you have also seen Facebook messages between Daniel's brother, Gary, and SO XXX talking to SO XXX about talking BT XX into recanting, and how if they do that, Daniel's lawsuit against the FBI will be successful, and they can share in the profits.

Ladies and gentlemen, at the end of the day, this is not a difficult case to understand. You have heard boy after boy disclose Daniel Johnson's sexual abuse of them, or his attempts to sexually abuse them. One by one they got on the stand and testified to you about Daniel Johnson grabbing their penises, making them grab his penis, performing oral sex on them, making them perform oral sex on him. And Daniel Johnson's sometimes successful, sometimes unsuccessful, efforts to anally penetrate them.

Now, you saw and you listened to these witnesses.

Does it sound like they were making it up for a witness fee?

Did it look like they were fabricating their stories to get immigration benefits? Do you think that 11-year-old LS XX XXX, raised in the rural provinces of Cambodia, coming to Phnom Penh just for the opportunity to go to school and living in this orphanage, do you think that LS XXXXX was coming up with a way in which to make up allegations so he

Page 1238

could game the American immigration system and eventually get a T visa at 11 years old? Does that make sense to anyone?

Taken together, these boys have painted a stark and horrifying picture of their lives at Hope Transition Center, where they were subjected to repeated sexual abuse by Daniel Johnson, where they were afraid of him, where he gave them money and food and gifts and provided shelter and schooling to them, and where what he got out of it was control and sexual abuse of them.

They told you that they knew they couldn't have resisted, that it wouldn't have made any difference. And that disclosing the abuse to anyone might have caused the orphanage to shut down, and for them to lose the food, shelter, and schooling they depended on.

The evidence has shown you that during the period where Daniel Johnson was abusing all of these kids, he traveled back and forth between the United States and to Cambodia. And each time he did so, he came and went from Oregon. As we told you, a person can have multiple purposes when they travel and you have to ask yourself whether a significant purpose of Daniel Johnson's travel was his ability to go back to Cambodia and abuse BT XX, ES XXX, LS X, SO XXX, VS XXXX, and CC X.

We believe that when you consider the evidence, the testimony, and the exhibits, the stipulated facts, and you

Case 6:14-cr-00482-MC Document 289 Filed 11/02/18 Page 100 of 169 Page 1239 1 follow the Court's instructions and use your commonsense, you will find that Daniel Johnson molested every one of these 2 boys, and that he traveled across state lines and to Cambodia 3 to continue doing so. 4 And given that recognition and the other evidence 5 6 before you, we believe that you will return a verdict of 7 guilty on all counts. Thank you. 8 THE COURT: Let's take a brief break while the 9 defendant sets up to give its closing argument. We will be in recess for five minutes. 10 11 (JURY OUT.) 12 (Brief recess taken from 1:33 p.m. to 1:44 p.m.) 13 14 THE COURT: All right. Bring the jury in. 15 (JURY IN.) 16 THE COURT: Please be seated, everybody. We will now hear from Ms. Maxfield for the defense. 17 18 19

DEFENSE CLOSING ARGUMENT

MS. MAXFIELD: Good afternoon, may it please the Court, Counsel, Mr. Johnson, ladies and gentlemen of the jury, I want to begin by thanking each of you. I know that these long trials, especially taking two weeks out of a spring period, can be burdensome and can be disruptive, both professionally and personally. And I want to thank you for

20

21

22

23

24

25

taking the time to do this.

Each of us has noticed how attentive all of you have been from the beginning to the end, and I want to thank you for that, too. I want to thank you, especially on behalf of my client, who appreciates the fact that as his fate is in your hands, you have taken the time to really pay attention to the evidence.

The American system of justice is unlike any other system of justice, we don't try the accused based on suspicion. We do not convict him based on conjecture, and in this case we certainly don't convict a person based on unreliable proof. In the American Court system a prosecution must prove a man's guilty beyond all reasonable doubt with descent, reliable, believable evidence.

Proof beyond a reasonable doubt. It doesn't mean that maybe he's guilty. It doesn't mean that probably he's guilty. It certainly doesn't mean that it's highly likely that he's guilty. To convict in American Court, you have to be sure, based on the evidence that you have actually heard in the case.

Maybe the best way to understand proved beyond a reasonable doubt is to look at the various levels of proof that we use in American Courts.

I see how you're doing that. She's way ahead of me.

Probable cause. What does probable cause mean? It

Page 1241

means that there's a quantum of evidence that would actually let you search a car, a person's car. It means there's probably something going on there.

Preponderance of the evidence. That means we get to a 51 percent chance, it's more likely that this occurred than that it didn't occur.

The next area is clear and convincing. Clear and convincing is a very, very high level of proof. The Supreme Court has said that it's one of those that leaves you without any significant doubt, but it's the level of proof that we actually are willing to take a person's child away.

In other words, you could lose your children if they can prove by clear and convincing evidence that you have done something that is harmful to them, or they are not safe with you. It's a very high burden of proof.

But higher than that still is proof beyond a reasonable doubt. And that means as you sort through the evidence, if there's any remaining reasonable doubt you have an obligation to acquit.

The Court is going to tell you that a reasonable doubt isn't one based on something that is imaginary or something that you have made up. A reasonable doubt is based on a lack of evidence, or something that is missing in the case, or something that gnaws you about what you heard.

What is an imaginary doubt? I don't know how many

Page 1242

of you scuba dive. I used to, and then ended up in the chambers and stopped that. But one of the things you do before you go down in the water is you want to check your regulator to make sure it's clear. And you might have checked your regulator before you got on the boat, you might have checked the regulator when you left the house. You might have checked your regulator five times in the car, but just before you step off the boat, you check your regulator again to make sure that it's clear.

Is that an unreasonable doubt? No. That regulator could have been clear 99 times out of 100, but it's not an unreasonable doubt to check the regulator before you jump. Same thing with a parachute. Nothing crazy about checking the chute to make sure it's folded exactly as it should be before you jump out of the plane.

Even though everything would suggest that everything is probably fine, there's nothing unreasonable about looking again to make sure that you are safe.

An imaginary doubt would be something crazy. I had a trial a little while ago, and the prosecutor had talked to the jury about circumstantial evidence. And she tells a story that prosecutors often do about the mom who bakes cookies and tells the boy, don't eat the cookies. And the mom leaves, and the little boy eats all the cookies. And the mom comes home, and she sees crumbs all over the cookies

Page 1243

(sic), she says, I think you ate the cookies. And the boy says, no.

And then the prosecutor says that's proof beyond a reasonable doubt. You can see it from circumstantial evidence. So my client was so upset about this that he came up to me afterwards and he said, well, that's not at all -- like what could have happened is like a guy could have been walking down the street. He could have walked in the house. He could have found those cookies, he could have eaten all but one. He could have forced the little boy to eat a cookie, and then he would have crumbs on him.

So that would be an imaginary doubt. That would be cobbling a bunch of crazy things together to call into question the level of proof. But in this case, a reasonable doubt just requires you to sift through the evidence carefully.

Where to begin in this case, because I think it's where the government has really failed to prove a material element, and it's an important material element. And that's in Counts 7 and 8. 7 and 8, each of these charges are different than Counts 1 through 6. Counts 1 through 6 actually talk about engaging in a sex act. That's kind of the core of the offense, to engage in a sex act.

But Counts 7 and 8 are thought crimes. It has to do with what is in the defendant's head. This defendant's head

at the time that he travels.

You were there, and then you weren't.

And the question really for all you is, why did Daniel Johnson get on a plane and fly to Cambodia? That's the question you have to answer, and you have to look at the evidence to see whether the government has proven that the reason he got on an airplane and flew to Cambodia is to have sex with kids.

7 and 8 both turn on his purpose and intent, and the Court has instructed you that the purpose and intent has to do with the dominant, significant, or motivating purpose. In Count 7, is the dominant, significant, or motivating purpose to engage -- to travel in foreign commerce to engage in illicit sexual conduct. And Count 8, the government has to prove the same thing, a dominant, significant, or motivating purpose of Mr. Johnson to travel across the state line to engage in sex with someone under the age of 12.

So the key question and the key period is, what is in his head when he gets on the plane. And the way we examine that is to look at the phrases, dominant, significant, and motivating purpose.

Dominant, an ordinary definition, is commanding or controlling or prevailing over all others. Significant, important, great, especially in leading to a particular result. Motivating, the reason one has for acting in a

particular way. And then contrary to that is incidental, accompanying, but not a major part of something.

So what was Daniel Johnson's purpose in traveling?

I think if you actually look at the evidence, that the evidence would point you to a single purpose for travel. The best way to understand why Daniel Johnson traveled, is to think about what he was focused on, and what he was doing in Cambodia, and why he would have left the country at the time.

Pretty soon you are going to see a slide that says reasonable doubt. Mr. Johnson traveled to fund and facilitate the Hope Ministries, good works in Cambodia. Look at the evidence and ask yourself, what did the evidence show that Mr. Johnson was doing during the relevant period in these counts. During the time he had been in Cambodia -- I think Karla Comstock begins in 2011, 2012 is when she comes to visit. And that gives a good sense of what he's up to.

Pastor Sopheak is also there during that period of time. And what Pastor Sopheak says is that during this period of time that he had met Daniel Johnson, and then he met a fellow by the name of Pastor Pilot are doing just ordinary good works in Cambodia.

And Daniel Johnson has managed to find a bunch of computers, and he set up this Coffee House where people can come and take Bible classes, learn English and work on a computer. At this time he has no intention or desire to run

any kind of Cambodian orphanage.

But Pastor Pilot at one point moves in, and Pastor Pilot brings with him several children. One day, and Pastor Sopheak talked to you about this, Pastor Sopheak is out in Prey Veng and he's looking for some land or property for them to build a Prey Veng compound on.

And while he's away, out of nowhere, Pastor Pilot and his wife leave, they leave the premises, and they leave the children behind. So at this point, things kind of shift, but not too much. Karla Comstock tells you by the time she gets there and she's meeting the children, that she has a sense that Daniel Johnson really -- that's not where his focus is.

You may recall she testified that she's going to go talk to him about the fact that he's being short or abrupt with the children, and she says, Before I began to even explain what I was upset with, he jumped into it just saying, I never knew I was going to be a single man working in this country with all these kids. It's really hard. She says he buried his head and threw his notebook down, and she doesn't remember if he started to cry or if he sobbed, but she does remember that he was very very upset.

She also remembers his energy in that time period, what he was focused on just personally. She said it was amazingly chaotic. Daniel Johnson was very busy, hectic,

Page 1247

kind of coming and going a lot. He just seemed overwhelmed, always giving people instructions for people to come and go and do this and do that. And making arrangements for the church teams to come to the center, to go out and do the good works. It was the good works that had Mr. Johnson's heart, and it was the good works that held his time, and it was the good works that held his attention.

The very, very best evidence, and frankly, the only evidence that you have about why Daniel Johnson traveled back to Cambodia is to look at the evidence about why he left Cambodia in the first place. And he left Cambodia to find a way to fund the good works projects that they were doing at Hope Transition. He would go to the United States, because it was the only way to fund the projects that they had going.

He would come to the United States and spend anywhere between five and eight weeks, and he would go around to these various churches, and he would have these fund raising events. And he would raise enough money over the period of time to fund the things that he was thinking about, or were in the planning stages back in Cambodia.

One of the very best pieces that gives you a clue about what Mr. Johnson was thinking while he was in the United States is to look at Government's Exhibit 311. In Government's Exhibit 311 -- and that's really tiny. What you see is they have pulled out of a Facebook page Mr. Johnson's

Page 1248

itinerary. This is what I am going to do while I'm in the United States.

And if you look at that itinerary, it's just chock full of fund raising, and visiting the various churches, to get the money together, and to get the support and try to find church teams that will come back to Cambodia to assist in the projects that they were doing.

So for example, in this one from April 26 to May 31st, from a solid month he's moving from church to church to church to raise money, to do fund raisers, and talk about the good works that they are doing, and try to keep the energy behind the forces of good works that Hope is engaged in in Cambodia. And then finally on May 31st he flies back to Cambodia.

Having spent four to eight weeks in the United States in Christian churches, raising money, why did he decide to go back to Cambodia? He decided to go back to Cambodia to spend the money. That's why he's going back to Cambodia. He's going back to Cambodia with the money that he's made, with the time investment, the teams that are now going to come, and he's going to engage in the good works that have been planned. That's his goal. That is his dominant purpose, that is his purpose and intent.

Anything else is peripheral. He has more wells he wants to dig. He has more eyeglass clinics that he wants to

Page 1249

put on. He wants to go back and fix the church in Kampot. He had money to do that.

In fact, in 2013, just as everything has exploded in his last trip to the United States, what's he focused on? He's focused on the medical clinic in the Prey Veng compound, the medical clinic that is partially finished. He's gone to raise money in the United States to finish that clinic. He's gone to get the medical supplies to actually supply that clinic, and that's the next phase of what he's going to do. Everything, everything, all of his focus, 100 percent of his focus when he leaves Cambodia and comes back from Cambodia is to make these projects work. And there's no other evidence in the record.

The government's suggestion that there's some peripheral purpose in him leaving the United States and then coming back really doesn't make any sense if you think about what he's doing, where his focus is on. If the government is correct and his sole focus is on molesting children, or even primary focus is on molesting children, why leave Cambodia in the first place?

He leaves Cambodia to fund the projects and in these two elements, 7 and 8, the government has failed to prove this -- these two charges beyond a reasonable doubt, because they have failed to establish he has an ulterior purpose, his motivating purpose, his significant purpose in traveling.

Page 1250

You are going to have in the jury room exhibits --I have shown you a few, but you are going to have a gazillion. You have seen us go through this, because we wanted to give you a sense of what our client was doing in this country. But you are going have a gazillion photographs, itineraries, you are going to have conversations all focused on what Mr. Johnson was focused on, and that's the good works in Cambodia.

Now I want to talk about the other charges more generally. A different measure. We're dealing with a different culture. We're dealing with people who come from a very different place, who have very, very different lives than any of us.

In trying to measure the motives of people and trying to measure whether something is a benefit, trying to measure whether someone would make an accusation or not make an accusation, it would be a terrible mistake to use an American ruler. Because the government stressed, and we all stressed in this case that the Cambodian witnesses are very, very poor. They are very deprived. They are looking for ways to survive.

And it's all very true. That's exactly who these people are. That's exactly where they have come from. The Cambodian witnesses have lived in a very poor, undeveloped country. And they testified their parents have died, or

Page 1251

abandoned them, or simply were unable to provide them with even the basics of food and shelter. That's who these witnesses are.

Karla Comstock describes the country as being -she's overwhelmed by how extremely impoverished it is, how
it's run down, and the people need so much. They don't have
a foot to stand on. She talks about the fact that there
aren't very many educated people in the country to build it
back up, and people are needy, hungry, wonderful people to
work with. But it's that level of need and deprivation you
need to keep in mind as you measure motive.

SO XXX describes why he lives with his uncle. As you recall, his parents disowned him, and abandoned him, and just kind of given up on him. And he talks about going to live with his uncle, and he says that he's up very, very early in the morning and constantly working until midnight. And that's what is expected of him. That's how his day goes.

Again, we're talking about people with a level of deprivation and desperation that is probably unlike the people that any of us know in this country.

As a result of that, you have witnesses who have been conditioned to focus first on what it's going to take to survive. Survival is and always will be the bottom line. It just will be. As you recall, there was some testimony about it's a common problem in Hope Transition with the folks that

Page 1252

lived there with stealing and lying, and just had these kids coming in. BT XXXXXXXX, I think, he was questioned about the little boy who kept stealing, and a description of what to do -- check his pack, send an older boy to school with him, do all of these things because this was part of how the kid interacted, trying to take what he needed.

If you recall LS X's final punishment that he and I talked about on cross-examination, perhaps the most serious punishment he had was for stealing some money. Even ES XXX talks about this. There's a story he tells about getting in trouble for the new shirt, the new shirt that he brings back, claiming that a neighbor has just given him the new shirt. He ended up getting punished on that occasion, presumably because Mr. Johnson believed it wasn't a gift, and in fact, it was a shirt that had been stolen.

I only tell you these stories, because it gives you a sense of what these kids are up against, and what it is that motivates them, and how it is that they get through life. And it's important to keep in mind as you sit through the evidence in this case. From birth these are young men who have learned they won't survive, let alone succeed, unless they are willing to scrape, and sometimes steal, manipulate, and yes, in this case, sometimes lie. They have been conditioned to keep a sharp eye out for the next opportunity.

Page 1253

Reasonable doubt. Hopes and promises. The young Cambodian witnesses are deprived, but they are not unmotivated. These are not just -- they haven't given up. These are kids that are as induced by a prayer and induced by a hope as they are by a promise. They know any opportunity shouldn't be squandered, that you need to grasp the next opportunity because it might be your last one. They have an eye out for it, and they will invest energy in obtaining it.

The government made the witnesses a few really significant promises in this case in exchange for cooperation. Motivators by themselves, but they also left a huge amount of room with these witnesses for hopes and prayers. Things that you might get, things that you probably could get. And it's kind of in this area of hopes, prayers, and promises that we find the chief motivators in this case.

Judge McShane has instructed you, it's in the instruction on testimony of witnesses, compensation and benefits. That you should examine the testimony of these witnesses who receive benefits from the government with greater caution than with other witnesses.

This is -- I mean, this isn't minor. It's something you should consider seriously as you sift through the evidence and think about why people said the things they said, and why people did the things they did.

Now, all of the government witnesses are going to

Page 1254

make about \$2,800 just in witness fees. A lot of that, I hope, will go home with them, although LS X says he ate all of his. Maybe he discovered room service or something else about our country. But hopefully, some of this goes home, because one of the things you learned from the expert witness today is that a police officer in Cambodia makes \$240 a month.

So \$2800 gives you, what, about 10 months, 11 months of salary. That's -- that is -- that's a motivating amount of money in the place where these folks live.

But I submit to you that really that's not all that's in play here. There are other potential benefits, other potential parting gifts that are much, much more significant than the cash that might go home. And I want to look at what has happened to BT XXXXXXXX, to discuss that.

BT XXXXXXXX agreed to cooperate, and as a result, he was promised, first of all, an extended visa that allows him to stay for a period of time. But with that comes much, much more. What is the value -- think about the value you put on the path to US citizenship. We know many, many people who would give an arm and leg for such a path to US citizenship. It can't be ignored as a powerful, powerful motivator.

The government is going to say it was just BT XXX XXXX. None of the other people got that. And I want to look again at BT XXXXXXX's cross examination, and talk to you

Case 6:14-cr-00482-MC Document 289 Filed 11/02/18 Page 116 of 169 Page 1255 about how all of that played out. And then we're going to come back and ask whether that claim really makes any sense at all. Mr. Weinerman talked to Mr. BT X and he asked, "At some point you decided that you wanted to stay here, right?" Remember, this was at a time when Mr. BT X's -- he has this one-year visa, and it's about to expire and now he's deciding whether he's going to go talk with the FBI. So Mr. Weinerman says, "You wanted to stay here, right? "Mr. BT X, Yes. "And at some point you decided to talk to the FBI, right? "Yes. "And that was in February of 2014? "Yes. "And that's the first time you told them or anyone

in the United States about alleged sexual abuse by Daniel Johnson?

"Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"And you discovered at some point in 2014 before your visa expired that if you cooperated in the investigation of Daniel Johnson that you could be eligible to get a visa that would allow you to stay in the United States? "Yes.

```
Page 1256
              "And you have been here since August of 2013, right?
1
              "Yes.
2
3
              "And you have not been back to Cambodia in four and
    a half years, almost five?
4
5
              "Correct.
              "And the FBI helped you get that extension of your
6
7
    Visa; is that correct?
              "Yes.
8
              "And the FBI helped you find an attorney to do that
9
10
    correct?
11
              "Yes.
12
              "And your visa was extended before it expired?
13
              "Yes.
              "And it allows you to work?
14
              "Yes.
15
16
              "And you have been working here since you got this
    new visa?
17
18
              "Yes, I have been working at a grocery store in
19
    Beaverton.
              "And does this visa also allow you to go to school?
20
21
              "Yes.
22
              "And to get financial aid?
23
              "Yes.
              "And you have been able to do both, go to school and
24
    get financial aid, correct?
25
```

"Yes.

"And so you obtained another visa in 2016 which allows you to stay here until 2020, and you are allowed to apply for a green card within three years, correct?

"Yes.

"And it also allows you, within five years after obtaining the green card, to become a United States citizen?

"Yes.

"And it's your understanding, Mr. BT X, that to obtain this visa and to be able to remain in the United States, that you have to cooperate with the FBI in the investigation and prosecution of Daniel Johnson?

"Yes."

Now, that's the trade that was made. What did we learn from the testimony of BT XXXXXXXX? I want to look at these component parts. First of all, BT XXXXXXXX is in the United States, which creates the availability of this visa. So we learn that a person who is a victim of crimes like those charged in this case are eligible for an extended -- Mr. BT X called it a T visa if they cooperate with the FBI.

The FBI can and will help a cooperating witness to get an extended T visa, or if he or she keeps cooperating, the FBI will even pay for the help of an immigration lawyer. The FBI -- if the FBI asks the Department of Human Services to grant an extended visa, it's very likely to be granted.

Page 1258

That extended visa will allow someone to work in the United States. It will allow someone to go to school and get financial aid. Three years after that visa is extended you are eligible for a green card, and five years after that green card you are eligible for US citizenship.

Now, Mr. BT X's clock ran out, and he was in an unusual position. His clock ran out, he was literally in the country. And so the FBI had to provide this assistance maybe a little sooner than it wanted to provide. You listened to some of these kids talk about when they made the inquiry, kind of this, We will talk about that when the case is over.

But in any event, I think it's very, very likely that the other witnesses in this case would ask for the same sort of benefit, or the same sort of treatment that BT XXX XXXX has been given. In fact, they have said as much when they testified in this case.

SO XXX said -- we asked, "Did you talk to an attorney about how you could stay here after you are done in Court?" And he said, "I was just asking about going to school here, and they said that we could talk. We could talk after this, or later."

So in other words, this is a benefit we can talk about once this trial is done. But to suggest that it's not a benefit that is in the wings, I think really is disingenuous.

LS XXXXX says the same thing. I said, "When you talked to FBI Martha, do you remember telling her that you wanted to come to the United States to go to school, and to be a doctor?" And he said, "Yes, I did tell her that."

"Is that still your hope?

"Yes.

"And when you talked to that lawyer, did you talk to him about maybe moving to the United States?

"Yes, I did.

"And have you talked with that lawyer since you have been here, or another lawyer since have you been here, in the United States about staying here?

"I did.

"Do you think there's some chance that you will be able to stay?

"I hope.

CC XXXXXX, also one of the kids who met with the lawyer, says the same thing. Mr. Weinerman asked, "In the beginning of the interview with the FBI on March 21st, 2017, about ten minutes into that interview did you ask the FBI when you will be going to the United States?

"Yes.

"And after you told the FBI on March 21st that
Daniel had sexually abused him, did you ask them whether you
can go to the United States?

Page 1260 1 "Yes. "Lindsay Alderson encouraged you to change your 2 story again, and tell the FBI that Daniel had sexually abused 3 4 vou. "Yes, she encouraged me to tell the truth. 5 "And you want to live with her in the United States; 6 7 is that correct? "Yes. 8 9 "And after that you told the FBI on March 21st that 10 Daniel hat sexually touched you, and you asked them if you 11 could go to the United States? 12 "Yes. "Did you talk to the attorney about trying to stay 13 14 here after testifying in this case? "I asked. I only asked. 15 16 "You asked if you could? 17 "Yes. VS XXXXXXXXXXXX also testified that he was someone 18 19 with a lawyer. And kind of as an aside here, VS XXXX also 20 had some pretty significant benefits that go a little bit 21 above and beyond witness fees. He tells you that after he 22 finally gets through and back home with his parents, the 23 authorities bring him a new bike. He doesn't know who the 24 authorities are, but those same authorities apparently paid for some repairs on his parents' home. And then it's 25

clarified later that actually, they gave him a new house and put a new roof on it. So VS XXXX's benefits were significant. In these kids' minds though, it's all just coming from the authorities.

ES XXXXXXX, what does he get? I would imagine
ES XXX gets whatever his brother LS X gets. That seems fair.
Almost certainly he would also talk to the FBI about filing
some kind of lawsuit. But ES XXX Soy gets LS X back. ES XXX
XXX doesn't tell the FBI that he's been abused until there's
this period where all of a sudden there's a chance for him
and LS X to be reunited. And another thing that ES XXXXXXX
gets is the promise that the questioning, all the authority's
questioning will finally, finally come to an end.

You recall on cross-examination that we talked to him about how often he had been questioned. "When you met with the FBI the second time, you told them you were meeting because you wanted it to finally be over?

"Yes.

"And you believed it wouldn't be finally over until you told them that you had been sexually abused?

"Yes.

"And then you were asked to come to this country?

"Yes.

"And to talk about it yet once again.

"Yes.

"And you came with the final hope that this would finally be over.

"Yes.

"And you have said what you need to say for it to be over?

"Yes."

ES XXX's motivation lies in having it be done, but he's probably in the same position that his brother is in if there's more to be hoped for.

Pastor Sopheak gets control of Prey Veng and Kampot.

Let me take you back --

THE COURT: Excuse me. It's the second time.

MS. MAXFIELD: These kids have cooperated with the FBI. They testified they were sexually abused in Cambodia. They come to this country and cooperated in every single way. How are they materially different from BT XXXXXXX? They are not. They are in exactly the same position that he is, and their hopes that access to this country, just to even come here to work here, to go to school here, and even to be a citizen here, the road should be no different. All that is different, I would submit, is the timing of when that hope becomes a reality.

A reasonable doubt. Tell a lie once, and all your truths become questionable. Every one of these young Cambodian witnesses believes that telling a pragmatic lie is

Page 1263

okay. And they make that very clear in their testimony to you. Instead of it being wrong, a pragmatic lie is viewed as a necessary survival tool, and a tool to success.

For these kids truth has more to do with whatever I am saying to you right now, and it has much to do with who is asking the questions. And you can tell that that is true by what they say to you. Every kid said, I lied, I lied.

SO XXXXXXXX, now when -- "SO XXXX, when you were first asked about sexual abuse by Daniel Johnson you said -- did you tell the truth?

"At first in Cambodia I didn't tell the truth. The first time with the FBI, I did not tell the truth.

"But you told APLE that Daniel didn't do anything to you sexually?

"Yes, at that time I didn't tell the truth.

"And about nine months later the FBI came to Cambodia, correct?

"The first FBI I did not tell the truth, either.

"So do you think it was wrong to lie about that?"

This is when he's talking about whether his parents are dead, and that was kind of interesting. He's telling the story about how he's been abandoned, that he can choose to stay with his uncle and live that life that has him up at 5:00 in the morning and working until midnight.

And what does he say? "I feel it was severely wrong

to do that, but my cousin said I had to do that. And if I didn't do that, I wouldn't be able to live there." He was willing to tell a lie to live in a better place.

The other kids also said that they had lied during

the investigation, and this is like a five-year investigation, so these things go back and forth and boomerang through. LS XXXXX says that he lied, as well. Talking about the interview with the FBI, "I told her, but I just told her so many times because I lied to her. There were times that I told a lie, but there were times that I told the truth."

ES XXXXXXX, he lied, as well. "So when you spoke to APLE and said that Daniel had not abused you, was that the truth or a lie?

"It was a lie.

"And that same year, did you meet with a woman named Martha from the FBI?

"Yes.

"Did you lie to her, also?

"Yes. Everything I said was a lie. It was a lie, and it was not because I was scared and it was not because I was nervous, or anything like that.

"So then pretty much everything you said to Martha was untrue?

"Correct. It was a lie."

Page 1265 1 We're going to come back to this interview in a minute, because it's a significant interview in this case. 2 But it's just a matter of fact, that was a lie. CC XXXXXX 3 said he lied. "Did you later say that Daniel Johnson had 4 never touched you? 5 "Yes. 6 7 "Was that the truth or a lie? "A lie. 8 9 "And why did you tell that lie at the time? 10 "Because I don't want them to ask me too many 11 questions. 12 "Okay. I understand that you are saying you lied to Martine? 13 "Answer, Yes. 14 "And you thought it was to okay to lie to Martine? 15 16 "Yes. 17 "And you told them that Daniel Johnson touched you? 18 "Yes. 19 "And you believed that is what they wanted you to 20 say? 21 "Yes. But --22 "But, go ahead. 23 "Yes. I was scared so I said I told a lie, because I don't want to have problems, you know, messy problems." 24 25 These kids are making decisions on what to say in

Page 1266 1 any given circumstance based on what tomorrow is going to look like, how messy their lives are going to be. 2 VS XXXXXXXXXXXX also lied. This is a conversation 3 he and I had about when Martine goes to visit VS XXXX after 4 he's finally gone home. He's been isolated from his parents 5 for a couple of years. "So about two years after Daniel 6 7 Johnson was arrested, do you remember a man named Martine 8 coming to your home village? 9 "Yes. 10 "And did Martine ask your parents if he could talk 11 with you? 12 "Yes. "And you and Martine went inside a church to talk? 13 "Yes. 14 "Was it a Christian church? 15 16 "Yes. 17 "And you didn't want to tell a lie inside the 18 church? 19 "Yes. 20 "And you told Martine that you had exaggerated and told lies when you talked with the FBI? 21 "Yes." 22 Are you getting there? 23 Calling ten witness who have admitted to lying, 24 depending on who is asking the questions -- and again, that's 25

Page 1267

how the government has couched it, and that's because now we're in trial and now they are the dominant force asking the questions.

Calling ten witnesses who have lied during a five-year investigation, admitted that they have lied is an evidentiary ploy to paper over the fact that the government is relying on unreliable witnesses. It's built its case on unreliable witnesses.

Rather than meet its burden with reliable evidence to prove beyond a reasonable doubt, the guilt of Daniel Johnson, the government calls ten witnesses, each of whom admitted to lying about the case, and then tells you, because there are ten of them, if you add them all together, that's proof beyond a reasonable doubt.

No. No. Together they add up to ten individuals who have told serious untruths in the course of a five-year investigation. Ten admitted nontruth-tellers don't add up to proof beyond a reasonable doubt, nor 20, nor would 50.

The fact that they have all come through this gauntlet and told things that are untrue doesn't make the whole more believable than the parts.

Reasonable doubt. The contaminating influences and coercive pressures in this case are mind blowing. The Cambodian police, or as I call them, the Canadian police which makes them seem so much nicer on horses and funny

Page 1268

hats -- but the Cambodian police are scary folks. And they aren't scary in the abstract. Every Cambodian kid knows that it's smart to be afraid of the Cambodian police.

The Cambodian police and the Cambodian authorities are corrupt. And they are corrupt on a scale that we can't really imagine in this country, and every Cambodian kid has adjusted life according to that truth. Karla Comstock talks about it, and Trudy Jacobsen talked about that earlier. It's a fact of life in Cambodia. It's a system built on corruption, and if you are a kid who wants to survive, if you are a deprived kid who doesn't have a lot of tools to get from point A to point B, appreciating the corruption of a Cambodian police officer is a wise thing to do.

There are other influences in this case, and we have got church members talking to these kids about what to tell or not to tell. When you combine God, and -- God and the sponsorship, the money, not only is it God is telling you to do this, but you might recall SO XXX who had denied, denied, denied, is now being questioned by CC XXXXXXX's sponsor, Ms. Alderson. And all of a sudden has his own account of abuse. And what follows that? What follows that is a new sponsor. And maybe a new place to live.

So this potent combination of God and money is something you have to think about as you sift through the evidence. And we all know basically about peer pressure, and

Page 1269 1 that peer pressure plays it own part in a case like this when all these kids are talking. But no influence, none at all 2 3 are as coercive and as corrosive as what the Cambodian 4 National Police brought to this table. The Cambodian National Police believed in an 5 6 investigation by intimidation and isolation of these boys, 7 and it had an impact. Every one of these kids talked to you 8 about the fact that they were afraid. LS X says, "Many 9 people came and we were afraid. It wasn't just a few." CCXX XXXX, he gives a pretty good description. "Are you scared of 10 the Cambodian police? 11 12 "Scared. "They have a bad reputation, don't they? 13 "Yeah, they have bad attitude in general. No good. 14 15 "Aggressive? 16 "Yes. 17 "Mean? 18 "Yes. 19 "Dishonest? 20 "Not honest. Not honest. Yes. 21 "You can get in trouble if you don't do what they 22 want you to do, correct? 23 "Correct. "And you can also get in trouble if you don't say 24 what they want you to say? 25

Page 1270 1 "Yes. "So you also said later that when you were talking 2 3 to the FBI about a year later, that you were in a panic because of the police being there? 4 "Fear." 5 VS XXXX had the same sort of fear. "Do you remember 6 7 how many police came? 8 "I don't remember. There were many. 9 "There were many? 10 "Yes. 11 "Were the children at the center, the kids at the 12 center frightened when the police came? 13 "Yes. 14 "And you were frightened, too; is that right? 15 "Yes. 16 "The Cambodian police, they are scary. 17 "Yes. 18 Celena Ocen, the US missionary who had come, she 19 tells this interesting story. She's there at the compound 20 and she's there at the Hope Transition Center on the day the police swooped in. And it's a very small part of her 21 22 testimony, but it gives you a picture for how frightening the 23 Cambodian police are. She says at the very end, it's late at night, and 24 all of these kids have been questioned, and it's been a long 25

Page 1271

day. And the Cambodian Police are kind of swooping these kids into vans. And then there's a commotion, because the people in the village come and try to grab the children away from the Cambodian police.

She said, "I observed that the kids were being escorted to the van. And that there were other individuals who were trying to take the kids. And the people who might have been resisting, they were the friends, relatives of the kids, who maybe wanted them to prevent them from being taken to another location. They were just the Cambodian people."

So imagine this scene as the Cambodian police are collecting these kids into the vans, and people in the village -- or people in the village come to do what they can to separate the children from the Cambodian police. It tells you a lot about the impact and the influence of the Cambodian police, and the fears that the people in the community had when they find themselves interacting with these folks.

The prosecution witnesses also described the pressures that were put on them during this process. You have these police officers who are kind of watching -- first of all, they take over the compound. They are watching all over these kids. They take the kids and literally collect them on benches, or in corners, and tell them they are not allowed to move around, that they are basically prisoners.

So these kids sit there. They are coerced into

silence, and then they are taken off to be questioned. This is CC XXXXXX, CC XXXXXXX being questioned. Look at what is surrounding CC XXXXXXX. He's asked about this picture and who are these people, perhaps, it's a police agent.

But in any event, what does he say? They keep questioning him, there were many. The words, the question words is the same words over and over and over and over again. That's what is happening to CC XXXXXX as those grown men stand around him, asking him questions. And apparently we need to ask them over and over, because we don't get the answer we want the first time the question is asked.

Same thing happened with CC XXXXXXX. "Was it a friendly atmosphere?

"Yes.

"And you weren't scared" -- I know, when Martine comes. Martine comes, and he's going to talk to him about what is going on.

"And was it a friendly atmosphere?

"Yes.

"And you weren't scared like you were when you talked to the Cambodian police?

"Yes.

"And he asked you about what happened when you talked to the Cambodian police on the day that Daniel was arrested?

Page 1273 1 "Yes. "And you told Martine that you felt pressured to 2 3 talk to the Cambodian police? And you felt like you had no choice, you had "Yes. 4 to talk to them? 5 "Yes. 6 7 "And you told Martine that you didn't tell the 8 truth? 9 "Yes. 10 "And you just told them what you believed they wanted to hear? 11 "Yes." 12 LS XXXXX was questioned, as you remember. He talked 13 14 about four or five policemen. Only one is asking questions, 15 but he talks about how they are kind of circling or swarming 16 around him as the one person is asking questions. He's very, 17 very aware of multiple police presences as he's asking 18 questions. 19 But even more key to what is going on with LS X this 20 day is that he has been physically separated from his 21 brother, ES XXX, on purpose, I would submit, because it's a two-year separation, as it turns out. But ES XXX and LS X 22 23 are separated, and that's the environment, and that's the context in which LS X is questioned. And the questioning 24 25 didn't end until the police heard what they wanted to hear.

"Let's talk about while you were still being questioned by the police. You said that they asked you questions again and again and again. Did that happen at the Hope Transition Center?

"Yes.

"So they asked you, they would not stop questioning you until you told them that you had been touched?

"Yes.

"That was the only way to make the questioning stop?

"Yes."

It's kind of interesting if we look at what happened with ES XXX that day. The Government Exhibit 105, there he is on the day that the police arrive, and he's looking away. And you recall him being asked by counsel about that look on his face, and he just didn't want to say anything to them. He's obviously not pleased to be in that environment. He's not pleased to be questioned. It's written all over his body, and it's written all over his face.

But the next exhibit is pretty interesting. Look how he's dressed. The very next day, 12/9 he's looking way and looking aside. By 12/10 they are back again, and he's dressed in exactly the same shirt. And now he's being questioned anew. Apparently the things that were said on 12/9 weren't satisfactory to the police, so they show up again on 12/10.

Page 1275

His parents, his mom is actually petitioning the Cambodian Courts to try to have her son back, so to have access to her son and it doesn't happen. It doesn't happen for two years, over two years before he actually gets to go home. These are the pressures that these kids found themselves in.

RT XX tells the story, although he tells it on cross-examination because he told it earlier, when he was first talking to FBI. When he was first talking to the FBI he said this: "When we had the problem, the police came down to interview each of us. There were a few police officers who were not convinced in what I was saying. They tried to give me the answers they wanted to hear."

And the FBI said, "What did they want to hear?" And RT XX said, "I think what they want to hear from us is something bad or allegation." And he describes the exact

Page 1276

same situation that you are seeing in these photos, although now he finds himself as a government witness.

The other key to all of this is that the authorities are the authorities are the authorities are the authorities. These kids find themselves, in the first instance, intimidated and questioned by the Cambodian National Police, but there is no daylight between the Cambodian National Police and the FBI.

Now, we all know that our FBI are not the Cambodian police. But they are not viewed this way. Each of these kids knows when they go in for their FBI interview, which takes place at the Cambodian National Police office, that in the room next to them is a bunch of Cambodian National Police officers who are watching what they say in these videotaped interviews.

I am sure that there's a not-scary reason for why that is occurring, but for these kids who are already intimidated, now they go in to be interviewed by the FBI, the people who had interviewed them at the center are now in the room next-door, watching what they say on videotape. And these kids know it.

CC X: "And there were some people there listening or watching from the Cambodian National Police?

"Yes, perhaps watching the video.

"And you were concerned that if you told FBI Martha

different than what you told the Cambodian police, that you could get into trouble?

"Yes.

CC X, and there were people there listening or watching from the Cambodian police -- I think it was VS XXXX who also talked about it.

Anyway, there were several of these kids who knew that while this is going on, they are being interviewed by the FBI, supposedly a professional forensics interviewer, but in the shadows, in the back room, are the people that had intimidated them before.

Repeated interviews, repeated coaching. You have listened to a number of witnesses come into this courtroom and tell a story, and it's been a story that has been put together professionally. It's been a story that has, as counsel showed you, the corroborating witnesses, and all of the connections.

But what has come before you five years after the fact has layers and layers and layers of things that happened before. What you saw has been built over several years, and it's been built as a result of repeated interviews. And what really is repeated coaching.

There are nearly 30 -- we're going to move down to 30 inconsistent statements. There are nearly 30 prior inconsistent statements that this case has been built on.

Page 1278

These kids have been interviewed multiple times. LS X was four. Somebody was up to five, seven, six.

And that doesn't include when the defense investigator went to talk to a kid, or when someone less formal, like a church person, talked to the kids. These kids have been interviewed and asked questions about the events that you heard about for a long, long time.

Let's look at the inconsistent things, the things different than what you heard in this courtroom. ES XXX is questioned first on the day that they come to the center. And here he is, again, in Exhibit 105, when apparently that was not a satisfactory interview, he's interviewed again the very next day.

In January of 2014 you heard testimony that he and SO XXX talked to the people at APLE and NGO, and told them no, we were not sexually abused. Then on November 14th -- and this was the long FBI interview that the government didn't show you. But ES XXX and I talked about it. It's an interview that lasted an hour -- he recalled somewhere an hour and a half, but it really is an hour and 24 minutes.

And he was asked for an hour and 24 minutes again and again and again whether anyone sexually abused him. And in the course of that interview, 20 denials. That's what this case is built on. That's what ES XXX said to the FBI on November 14th in 2014, when it was the answer that he thought

was going to put him in the best place for tomorrow.

In June of 2015 he's questioned again by the defense investigator and he adamantly denies to Martine that he was sexually abused. The defense investigator comes back a year later. He still adamantly denies that he had been sexually abused.

Finally in March 2017 ES XXX tells the FBI what they want to hear. And he explains why he does that, that if he kept telling it like he had been telling it, that this still is not going to finish. It's not going to be over.

LS XXXXX. LS X's story isn't like a back and forth and back and forth. LS X's story is one that grows bigger and bigger as a result of repeated interviews. It starts small with playing with my penis, I think is what Pastor Sopheak said.

But he talks again about how the questioning doesn't stop. "So they asked you -- they would not stop questioning you until you told them that you had been touched?

"Yes.

"And that was the only way to make the questioning stop?

"Yes."

So with each story he adds more to the story and more to the story, but like his brother, he's a young guy who wants the questioning to end. And he believed it never would

unless he provided the account that the authorities were looking for, or maybe even insisting upon.

CC XXXXXX, again, is interviewed on December 9th.

Again, they come back to him like ES XXX on December 10th for a follow-up interview. In June of 2015 he's interviewed by Martine, and we have already talked about this, but he tells Martine that he was intimidated by the Cambodian National Police, and that he simply told them what they wanted to hear and that he had not been sexually abused, and he only said that because that's what they were insisting upon. In this June 2016 when Martine comes back, he confirms that same account.

VS XXXXXXXXXXXXXX is a kid who goes back and forth and back and forth, too. He went -- but I think the two that you should pay attention to, once he's finally allowed to go home and be with his parents, he talks to his father. And his father asked him whether he's been sexually abused, and he tells him that nothing had happened with Daniel Johnson, and D had done nothing wrong.

And then he has this interview with Martine that takes place in the church. And I think that for VS XXXX an interview that takes place in a church actually had some meaning. And he tells Martine that he had exaggerated and told lies to the FBI when they had questioned him.

BT XXXXXXX, BT XXXXXXX started out telling people in

Page 1281

the church that he hadn't been sexually abused. And, in fact, no one had been sexually abused, and that's basically the account that he provides in the month of December.

So he began by denying any sexual abuse had occurred, and then a few months before his visa had expired he kind of changed course. It was then that he was interviewed by the FBI, maybe five, six more times, and with each FBI interview his story also grew. But the growth in his story is a growth that matches the promise of a visa.

If you -- if what the government had presented were a number of witnesses, and what you heard from these witnesses is not, they talked about a visa, and maybe I can get a visa. If what you heard from that witness was, the government gave me a million dollars to cooperate in this investigation, that would cause you some pause. And you would have to think very, very seriously about what -- the reliability of what you are hearing from the witness stand.

Well, what the government gave Mr. BT X is worth at least a million dollars to many, many people. You might compare it to like these E-5 investment visas that people pay a million dollars to get. Wealthy Chinese people agree to put a million dollars within the US economy to get access to our country, and to our citizenship exactly like Mr. BT X finds himself with today.

That's what it is worth to people to live in this

Page 1282

country. It's worth a lot. And as you are measuring motives and incentives you can't lose sight of the value.

Now, SO XXX had denied and denied and denied. He told APLE, along with ES XXX, that there had been no sexual abuse. And then in November, just like ES XXX, he sits in for a two-hour interview. Two hours with the FBI, and for two hours denies again and again and again and again and again that he had been sexually abused. Then boom. His best friend, BT XXXXXXXX, gets a visa. And in 2016 SO XXX tells the FBI for the very first time that he had been sexually abused, too.

The evidence in this case leaves reasonable doubt around every single corner. In Count 7 and 8 the government has completely failed to prove a material element of the crime. Mr. Johnson's intent and purpose for traveling to Cambodia was to bring back the charitable donations to fund the good works.

And all of the evidence, all of the documentary evidence, the witness evidence, everything supports that that is why he left Cambodia, and that's why he came back.

As to the other Counts 1 to 6, those allegations are built upon witnesses who, first of all, told you about a willingness to lie, depending on who is asking the questions. It's built upon inducements and benefits that are more valuable than almost any I've seen in any case. And it's

Page 1283

built upon inconsistencies that have papered over governmental witness coaching, and the fact that these kids really have been whipped back and forth. It happened, it didn't happen, it happened, it didn't happen, depending on which authority is asking the question.

In the end there's nothing but reasonable doubt if you think through the motives, and think through the history. There's only one person in this case that is entitled to reasonable doubt. When we come into these cases we think about all the witnesses, and what a struggle it is to get them on the witness stand, and go through this, and have 12 grownups in a box and staring them down.

But the truth is in a criminal trial, there's only one person entitled to the benefit of your reasonable doubt, and that person is Daniel Johnson. In the American Courts, he's the only person who is entitled. The Constitution gives him and him alone the benefit of proof beyond a reasonable doubt.

BT XX, ES XXX, CC X, VS XXXX, SO XXX, none of them is entitled to proof beyond a reasonable doubt. There's only one person who is entitled to the benefit of those doubts, and that's Daniel Johnson.

If the witnesses give radically inconsistent accounts in this courtroom than they have given on other days, it's Daniel Johnson who is entitled to your reasonable

Page 1284

doubt. If the rewards for cooperating are so valuable that it causes pause and might tempt some people to lie, it's Daniel Johnson who is entitled to the benefit of your reasonable doubt.

Weaknesses in the case should never benefit the government, ever. This makes sense because there's only one person whose fate is in the balance. Every single witness here will go home to a life when this case is over, no matter the result. It is Daniel Johnson who faces the loss of liberty, and that's the reason our Constitution provides him with the protective cloak that it does.

Pretty soon, very soon, Daniel Johnson's fate will be yours and yours alone. When this happens, the whole dynamics in this courtroom is going to change. You will become the most powerful people in the courtroom. You will be certainly more powerful than me, more powerful than any of these folks sitting at counsel table. And in that jury room, even more powerful than Judge McShane.

Because your job is different than our jobs. Our job is to do the law. We are here to handle all of the legal issues. If I make a mistake on the law, if counsel makes a mistake, or even if the judge makes a mistake on the law, the Appellate Courts are there to fix our mistakes.

But you and only you are the finders of the facts.

That is your job, your job alone. No lawyers and no Courts.

And sadly, your mistakes are yours alone.

I ask you to talk amongst yourselves as much as you can to sift through the evidence as carefully as you can, to think about the issues that have been raised and the concerns about how this case came before you, and all that lies under, historically, the testimony that you heard. And for all of those reasons, I will ask you to find my client not guilty. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Maxfield.

Do we need a break between rebuttal?

MR. SWEET: I would refer to the jury, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Do we need a short break?

A JUROR: We're good.

THE COURT: Mr. Sweet, go for it. Thank you.

REBUTTAL CLOSING ARGUMENT

MR. SWEET: I think Ms. Maxfield saw a different trial than what I saw. I think she observed the witnesses in a completely different light, and I think her recollection, though, perhaps well-intended and sincere, is different in many ways. And I would like to talk about that.

Ms. Maxfield categorized the boys as conniving, scheming, looking for an edge in any way. But did you see boys that were open and wounded and sincere? Did you see boys who talked to you, and explained the suffering that they

had been through? Did you see the raw emotion in them?

And as far as a visa, they were open about that, too. I don't know. I talked to somebody. I don't remember their name. I thought about it. Some said yes, some said no. Where is the conniving, scheming, manipulative boys that she depicted?

And the other thing that Ms. Maxfield -- she ignored huge parts of this case. What happened to the disclosures that the boys made prior to the arrest of Daniel Johnson? Where did those go? How much discussion did you hear about those? I didn't hear any. How much discussion did you hear about SO XXX going to Pastor Sopheak at the second house, and talking about Daniel Johnson trying to put his penis in SO XXX? Where was that?

How about LS X and ES XXX going to Pastor Sopheak,
LS X crying, Pastor Sopheak talking to them? Pastor Sopheak
sending a message about it to BT XXXXXXXX. This is before
Daniel Johnson's arrest. Did Ms. Maxfield talk about that?

And BT XXXXXXX remembered getting that message that discussed this. And then Pastor Sopheak confronted Daniel Johnson about it, and he messaged BT XXXXXXXX about that, too. Where was that?

And then BT XXXXXXXX, BT XXXXXXXX on December 8th in America, he wrote, "Daniel tried to have sex with me but I didn't let him." So as of the day of Daniel Johnson's

Page 1287

arrest, BT XXXXXXX is already talking about attempted sexual abuse, from BT XXXXXXX.

And counsel labeled all the boys liars. Well, I think I missed that, too. Where did SESX, and SS XX and LT XXXXXXX -- where did they lie? Those are the ones who came in March of 2017. You may remember SESX. SESX is the one who said, "I will always love him forever," when talking about Daniel Johnson. He was one who it pained him to say anything remotely negative about Daniel Johnson. How is he lying? Because he disclosed that Daniel Johnson had tried to touch his genitals on several occasions, and he also disclosed that ES XXX and SO XXX had told him about abuse prior to Mr. Johnson's arrest. Where was that?

What about SS XX? SS XX, who said that Daniel

Johnson tried to touch his buttocks. He also said SO XXX

disclosed prior to arrest. Where are the lies for that? She

labeled everyone a liar, but they are not.

SESX, SS XX, LT XXXXXXXX, BT XXXXXXXX started early.

And LS X, LS X disclosed abuse from the beginning. He disclosed more, but he disclosed abuse from the beginning.

And this was painted as some professional, coached, manipulated series of events.

Well, that's funny because a couple of boys recanted right away. You have got the stipulation about SO XXX and ES XXX recanting to APLE. So a couple of questions about

Page 1288

that. What were they recanting? They are recanting their accusations. They are recanting something. And if the Cambodian National Police and APLE are all so corrupt, why are they reporting this recantation to the FBI?

This isn't some polished, professional, rehearsed presentation. Let's think about it. When did the FBI first contact SESX, SS XX, and LT XXXXXXXX? March 2018, less than two months before trial. If these boys were waiting to come to the US for money, what were they going to do, wait until late March of 2018?

No. The FBI reached out to them. The FBI reached out to those boys, and they came here, and they spoke. And they gave really limited disclosures. All of them were attempted touching of either the genitals or the buttocks. They didn't have the same level of abuse that you heard from others.

But how can they all be called liars? Just because Ms. Maxfield, with all due respect, says something, it doesn't make it true. Just because I say something, it doesn't make it true. You all are the deciders of fact. You all listen and hear and judge the evidence that comes in from the witness stand.

I think many things that Ms. Maxfield said, she talked about her opinion: I think or it's really very likely. Well, that's her opinion, and she's entitled to it,

Page 1289

but just because he says it 50 times doesn't make it true.

Evidence, opinion, and arguments. So what basis does she have for calling all these boys liars? She just gave a blanket label, and it's not true. Like Hagar, she talked about VS XXXX, VS XXXX getting a bike. I believe VS XXXX testified the bike came from Hagar, which was the center that helped boys.

And here's the thing that we all have to remember. These boys are dealing with a difficult, traumatic, emotional circumstance. If this were a polished presentation from the beginning, if this were coached and orchestrated, do you think it would have looked like this? Do you think you would have had recantations? Do you think you would have had these different stories?

No, it would have been put together from the start. But it's not. It's real. It's these boys dealing and coping with what happened to them. Boys in difficult, difficult circumstances. And here's the other thing, behind all of this --

Well, another thing I have to say that Ms. Maxfield didn't talk about that we're going to talk about. She didn't discuss at all the prior statements of the boys before Daniel Johnson's arrest. The other thing she didn't talk about, she didn't talk about BT XXXXXXXX's chats with Daniel Johnson.

Where Daniel Johnson said, "I am not saying anyone is wrong."

Page 1290

That's after being accused already of -- "I knew long time already that you had sexual abuse to the kids." "I am not saying anyone is wrong, really."

Is that how people respond to that? We're going to talk about that. But that was something that you haven't heard of.

I need to discuss Daniel Johnson for a minute, because Daniel Johnson was the puppet master in this case. He manipulated the boys, he controlled the boys, and there's a message that we haven't discussed yet. I believe it's Exhibit 170, if that's the one I just handed over. And I want to talk to you about it for a minute.

So this is a message that helps to explain the influence that is put on these boys, not by the Cambodian National Police, not by the FBI, but by Daniel Stephen Johnson. So I am going to walk you through this. It's from the Gary Donna Johnson account, which the FBI discussed with you was used by Daniel Johnson's brother.

And in there it talks about, "I went to jail and I may need him to come to the US to testify." So I think you will be able to see that this was passed on by someone else and written by Daniel Johnson. So you are going to recognize a lot of the names in here.

Let's start the second line at the top. So first line starts about talking about Daniel, but then it moves

Page 1291

into -- it talks about Gary talking about Daniel, and then it goes into what I am going to call the marching orders that are being issued. "LS X still needs to be removed from Hagar." We all know who LS X is, and we all know he was staying at Hagar. "His family needs to talk to him. APLE and Hagar are trying to get him to USA for trail."

And this is full of misspellings but try. It talks about blank documents. But how about this: "Get him out no matter what it takes." Get LS X away from Hagar. Get him away from a neutral party. Get him back under Mr. Johnson's control.

And then we go to VS XXXX, and you heard about VS XXXX talking to Martine, the defense investigator. VS XXXX in Prey Veng keeps changing his story. Why would that concern Mr. Johnson, if he's changing his story? He told Mr. Martine something negative. Negative in Mr. Johnson's world means implicating him.

"I think he is still afraid of police. His parents need to talk to him. They think he is speaking positive but he is not."

So we have talked about LS X, charged victim,
VS XXXX, charged victim. ES XXX, LS X's older brother, was
interviewed. During the interview with Martine, he got up
and walked out. Why? Because he was pro Daniel Johnson? Is
that why he got up and walked out from meeting with their

investigator?

"ES XXX, please encourage him and let him know I need him, and may need him to come to the US and to testify. He needs to be strong about the police scaring him in a closed room, and trying to get him to lie."

This one is Tola, you will see it's Tola. Asked by David Roth if Daniel did it, and Tola said, he did. "Tola needs to clarify this." Which way do you think Tola needs to clarify this? What does Mr. Johnson want him to do? He wants him to recant that. Tola was saying that based on what, and then he gives an explanation. That's what APLE and the Cambodian police were telling him and that's firsthand knowledge.

Sorry, speaking too fast.

David Roth, FBI, Tola misconstrued.

Let's go on to somebody you are going to recognize.

"RT XX needs to tell the investigator when he is asked that

APLE and police forced his fingerprint, but the document was

fortunately not negative." So truth has nothing to do with

anything. Mr. Johnson just issues his marching orders as to

what he needs these boys to say for his benefit, because he's

trying to control everything.

When we talk about BT XX, BT XX says he has a plan to stay in the USA. Let's go on to CC X. It's about three lines below -- about five lines below Tola. Far right.

Page 1293

"CC X needs to speak strongly that he was told he had to continue following the police with a lie, or he would go to jail. APLE would help his family." Now CC X is another charge victim.

"SO XXX said I gave him money after I went to jail.

He needs to clarify." A lot of boys need to do a lot of clarifying in Mr. Johnson's world. "He needs to clarify that the money came from Bill and Lonna to help him with school, not from me."

I am going to skip down. "Warn all of them to be careful with Peter and Kelby and Lindsay" -- probably Kelby and Lindsay Alderson, we heard testimony -- "BT XX," probably BT XXXXXXXX, "Chuck and Janice." More people -- "Phillip and Sue." And you wonder why some of the boys struggle in getting a consistent story. Because Daniel Johnson is behind the scenes being the puppet master.

So now I have to tell you, when you look at this case from the beginning, this is not about digging wells, this is not about building churches, and feeding the hungry. Those are all good things, and I hope that some part of Mr. Johnson found that to be valuable.

But this case is about his systemic and repeated sexual abuse of these boys, boy after boy, time after time, year after year. That's what this case is about.

Mr. Johnson, I don't think this was just a small purpose for

Page 1294

him. I think he was consumed with sexual abuse. He ran Hope Transition Center as his practical personal sexual playground.

And that's what he did to these boys there. He would go in at night, and choose which boy he wanted. And yes, did they need funds to keep it running? Sure he did. He would go back to America and get funds. Did he do some good things with those funds? Yes, he did, and that's a good thing. We're not saying every waking moment of Mr. Johnson's life was filled by nothing but abuse.

I am sure if he saw one of his children fall and scrape their knee he would pick them up, dust them off, and put a bandage on. But then he was abusing too many of them at night in his room.

And this case is not about money, or about visas.

Do you really think -- again, the defense is viewing these boys through a scheming, grasping, they are from a poor country, therefore, they are all just coming to say anything for money.

Do you think they got on a plane and flew over here and sat in the same room with the man who molested them, and took the stand and disclosed the most personal, graphic details they will hopefully ever have to say in their entire life? Do you think they did that for a per diem? You all presumably get a juror fee. I hope you get money for gas,

and a per diem for your hotel.

Do you feel compromised or bought? Is it worth more to them than it is to you? Sure. But is that why they are here? You heard them say, We didn't even know how much we were getting. Do you think when the Cambodian police came to Hope Transition Center on December 9, 2013, do you think those boys knew, well, Daniel Johnson's sexual abuse of me can be prosecuted in the United States of America?

How many of you, how many people do you think know that this crime, a crime committed in Cambodia, can be prosecuted here? How many teenagers do you think know that? How many 11-year-olds know that? And how many 11-year-olds in Cambodia at an orphanage know that?

They came here. They weren't bought. They are not here for a visa. There's no orchestrated scheming plan. You have all those boys saying -- and you have BT XXXXXXXX saying, halfway across the world at the same time.

Exhibit 277, please. This is going to take a second because I didn't tell them this one was coming.

This is BT XXXXXXXX and Knot. Second page, please very bottom, Knot, December 9th. "Did you have sex with him?" "No." It's on the next page. "He tried to but I didn't allow." Let's go back to the very first page, please. BT XXXXXXXX, December 8th, "I know Daniel is a good man but he's kind of demon spirit stay inside him. I have been

Page 1296

praying for him for six years and I did go talk with him, but he's still the same."

How is this a last-minute fabrication? That's December 8th of 2013, and he's talking about -- he's talking about not just what Daniel Johnson tried to do to him, but what he's been thinking about this whole time. And this isn't to the FBI. This is to Daniel Johnson's girlfriend that he's having the conversation with.

See, I talked to you about SESX. SESX who said, "I will always love him forever." And SO XXX said something like, "I loved him like my father." BT XXXXXXXX, he was worried about Mr. Johnson going to heaven, and he was concerned about his soul.

Are these young men with an axe to grind? Are these young men here who are vindictive, or they are trying to get something? It's not because of any benefit that they are here. It is in spite of Daniel Stephen Johnson's efforts to keep them from being here. It is in spite of the shame and the embarrassment. It is in spite of his efforts to silence them that they are here.

They endured. They sacrificed to be at that orphanage. There was a price to be paid for being at that orphanage, and that price for too many was sexual abuse. Why did they pay that price? BT XXXXXXXX told you. "Daniel gave money for my sick dad, and money for university." And BT XX

was going to be the first person to graduate university.

And LS X, what did LS X say when the police first came? This was LS X talking on the stand. When the police came he said, "I was afraid that we were not going to have a place to stay and we couldn't go to school anymore."

They are not going to jeopardize their situation. They are an impoverished country in a vulnerable situation. Mr. Johnson is the food on the table, the roof over their head, and the money for the school. And they are going to make something up and throw it all away for an uncertain future? For why? They cared about him.

Again, they are here in spite of Daniel Johnson's efforts to silence them. What did he say? He wrote to Becka Norris, "Silence is golden." He wrote to Lindsay Alderson, "Silence is all that we can do now." To BT XXXXXXXX, "Peace upon you and your tongue and wisdom in your thoughts, words, actions. Healing does not begin until we stop picking at the scab."

In other words, stop talking BT XX. Stop talking.

"Healing doesn't begin until we stop picking at the scab,

peace on your tongue." He's trying to get them to be quiet.

And I have to talk about Pastor Sopheak for a minute more. You see, I talked about these boys enduring the abuse, and endure they did, but there was a limit. Because SO XXX went to Pastor Sopheak, and Pastor Sopheak can tell you what

house it was, second house, what room it was. What that meeting followed. It followed a sermon about sin.

And SO XXX came and talked to him, and told Pastor Sopheak about what he did. And Pastor Sopheak didn't do anything with that information. And that's to his regret, because Pastor Sopheak -- you may recall he had kind of a nervous laugh. He smiled at times when it didn't make sense to smile, but then at the end I asked him, "Do you regret not telling anyone about SO XXX?" And he said, essentially, "It's really hard for me to think about that. I don't feel good inside. It's a burden that I carry, and I want to take a burden and release it. I feel like it's something I have to carry with me all the time and I want to be free."

Do you remember Pastor Sopheak on that stand? Do you remember him, how upset he was? Well, the good thing that came of that, is it stiffened his spine, because the next time those boys came to him he did something about it.

Because LS X and ES XXX, they came to Pastor

Sopheak. Now we're at the third house. And it was kind of

a -- I think it started with ES XXX, and ES XXX went and

spoke to Pastor Sopheak. And LS X was there, and LS X was

just crying. And Pastor Sopheak, he sent a message to BT XXX

XXXX about this, and he gave you the date of the message,

November 24th, 2014. And then he went and confronted Daniel

Johnson.

Page 1299

And Daniel Johnson said something like, "Well, they wanted something from me, and I didn't give it to them and they made this up." And remember ES XXX telling this from the other end, and he could hear the raised voices from in there. And then Pastor Sopheak sent another message afterwards to -- sent another message to BT XXXXXXXXX BT XXX XXXX remembered that, too.

And so you now have SO XXX disclosing beforehand. You have LS X and ES XXX disclosing beforehand. You have someone else who didn't endure in silence, and that's LT XXX XXXX. He just got up and left. He got up and left. I think it was three times that he said Daniel Johnson tried to touch his penis. He left, and he left his little brother there. He walked away from the orphanage, and you have heard about the hardship these boys suffer.

I think somewhere in one of the defense exhibits is a summary of LT XXXXXXX and his life, and what he came from. And what he would be going back to. I don't think everything on that summary is correct, because I think -- but it describes what they were risking and losing by walking away.

And then we talked about BT XXXXXXXX, December 8th.

And I am going to talk about BT XXXXXXXX, and I am not going to keep you much longer. But BT XXXXXXXX, he confronted Daniel Johnson. And this is Exhibit 163. And if you want to see anything that is full of information about this case,

it's Exhibit 163.

And on page 2414 BT XX says, as clearly as you could say, "I knew long time already that you had sexual abuse to kids but I didn't want to defile you." He goes on. Daniel Johnson in responding, he doesn't deny it. He doesn't admit it. The conversation continues. Later BT XX says, "Then you did appropriate to LS X and ES XXX." And again you are not going to see denials when you go through, but what you will see is sort of a back and forth. And finally BT XX, BT XX writes, "What did I do wrong? Just say the truth about what I had seen and experience with you in Cambodia."

Page 2421, and what is the response from Mr. Johnson? "I am not saying anyone is wrong. I am just saying that might be the wrong spirit in a situation based on scripture. I tell you I did nothing in the USA." And then, "I assure you there is nothing in Vietnam." But what about Cambodia? What about Cambodia? And it goes on.

And BT XX says later, "I really don't want to say anything" -- anything negative -- "but when people ask me what is the truth I can't lie." And Mr. Johnson gives some helpful answers for BT XX, "Brother, sometimes saying I am sorry, I don't want to talk about it or I don't want to speak anything negative or I don't know for sure. Right now the best thing you can do is pray, or I would like to think not."

We would all like to think not. But that's not the

Page 1301

case. Mr. Johnson didn't say, BT XX, you are lying. BT XX, this isn't true. BT XX, I didn't do anything. He didn't even ask who, who did I supposedly molest. That's not asked in here. He does say, "Peace upon you and your tongue." He does say, "Stand with me and stand close."

You see, at the end of the day, these boys, what they needed was they needed love from a parent. They needed that affection, and what Mr. Johnson wanted was sex. He took the love and the need and the affection in these boys, and twisted it into his personal sexual gratification.

SESX, SESX described Daniel Johnson coming in with a flashlight at night and taking a boy, his brother, SS XX. He described seeing Mr. Johnson come in and carry boys out of the rooms. We all know who his favorites are, you heard them. They are the boys who spent all the time in his room. A lot of those boys, the same ones who were abused.

See this case is not about wearing a towel that is too short. It's not about sending really weird romantic text messages or texts to the boys. It's not about getting a lot of massages. It's not even about having boys in your room. It's what he did to those boys' bodies once they were in his room. That's what this case is about.

Daniel Johnson needed to silence the boys, and you heard why. He violated their trust. He violated their bodies. And he violated the law. And you should find him

Page 1302

guilty of each and every crime that he committed. I thank you for your attention.

THE COURT: Folks, I have a short instruction to give you. I will come down here, because we have a screen.

When you begin your deliberations, select one member of the jury to act as the presiding juror or foreperson who will preside over your deliberations and speak for you in Court.

The presiding juror doesn't have any greater voting weight than any other juror, but is to be the spokesperson for the jury. You will then discuss the case with your fellow jurors to reach agreement, if you can do so. Your verdict, whether guilty or not guilty, must be unanimous. As well as with the individual questions you are being asked to answer, those must be unanimous.

Each of you must decide this case for yourself, but you should do so only after you have considered all of the evidence, discussed it fully with the other jurors, and listened to the views of your fellow jurors.

Do not be afraid to change your opinion if the discussion persuades you that you should, but do not come to a decision simply because other jurors think it is right.

It is important that you attempt to reach a unanimous verdict but, of course, only if each of you can do so after having made your own conscientious decision. Do not

Page 1303

change an honest belief about the weight and effect of the evidence simply to reach a verdict.

Perform these duties fairly and impartially. Do not allow personal likes or dislikes, sympathy, prejudice, fear or public opinion to influence you. You should also not be influenced by any person's race, color, religion, national ancestry, gender, sexual orientation, profession, occupation, celebrity, economic circumstances, or position in life or in the community.

It is your duty as jurors to consult with each other and deliberate with one another with a view towards reaching an agreement if you can do so. During your deliberations, you should not hesitate to reexamine your own views and change your opinion if you are persuaded that it is wrong.

If it does become necessary to communicate during deliberations with me, you may send a note through Ms. Pew, signed by one or more of you. No member of the jury should ever attempt to communicate with me except by signed writing, and I will respond to the jury concerning the case only in writing or here in open court. If you send out a question I will consult with the lawyers before answering it, which may take some time. You may continue your deliberations while you wait for an answer to any question.

Remember that you are not to tell anybody, including me and Ms. Pew, how the jury stands, numerically or

Page 1304

otherwise, on any question submitted to you, including the question of the guilt of Mr. Johnson, until after you have reached a unanimous verdict or have been discharged.

You have seen the verdict form. The parties have gone over it with you. When you have answered all of the questions on the verdict form, the presiding juror will sign the form, date it, and then notify the bailiff and we will reassemble to take your verdict.

It's up to you to decide what you want your schedule to look like. We want you to have as much time as you need. You are certainly welcome to go later today, if you wish. At some point, Ms. Pew might ask you, because we need to make sure some of the staff is still here to let people in and out of the building, if we need to. And then you can certainly set a time if you wish to return tomorrow.

So that is completely up to you how you want to schedule your time. There are two of you that are alternate jurors, and I know this doesn't -- seems unfair, I know.

So we have Mr. Watt and Nicki Taylor, so you are our two alternates. And you, at this time, are excused. You can go back and gather your things.

Couple of things, No. 1, I know it seems unfair that you want to say something to these 12, but it's these 12 who deliberate. You don't get to deliberate with them. Here's the other thing. We have to have 12 at the end of the case.

Page 1305

If an emergency occurs we have to call one of you back. So as a result, I am going to still admonish you don't look up information about the case. Don't talk to anybody about the case until we inform you that this jury has reached a verdict or it's been discharged.

It has happened before where somebody, one juror during deliberations gets so sick that we have to call back one of the alternates and ask you all to begin your deliberations all over again. That's why we hold you here until the very end to hear all of these instructions.

So this is how we do reach a resolution to conflict in our community. You know, it's not judges who make these decisions. It's not angry moms. It's not soldiers or religious leaders. We bring in people from the community.

12 of you have stepped up and taken that vow to be jurors, and resolve this for us.

And I want to thank all of you for the time you put into this case. I will now have you return to the jury room. The verdicts will -- excuse me, the instructions will be brought back for you to have. I think each of you will have a copy, as well as all of the exhibits that have been received into evidence for you to look at.

You can begin your deliberations immediately following picking your presiding juror. But with that, I would like to thank all of you.

We can stay standing for my oath to the bailiff.

THE COURT: Do you solemnly swear to keep this jury together in some private and convenient place; that you will not permit any person to speak or communicate with them, nor do so yourself, unless by order of the Court; or to ask them whether they have agreed upon a verdict; that you will return them into court when they have agreed, or ordered by the Court?

COURT CLERK: I will.

THE COURT: Ms. Pew will have you back to the jury room. Thank you very much.

(Jury Out.)

THE COURT: People can be seated. I assume Ms. Pew knows how to get ahold of everybody, but make sure she has your cell phone and e-mails. Around 4:30 I will have her check with the jury and see if they are going to go past 5:00, if we need to let our security folks know if that's the case, or whether they are going to break at a particular time. So she will get ahold of you if there's any questions or anything else occurs.

Anything else we need to discuss?

MR. SWEET: Nothing from the government, Your Honor.

MR. WEINERMAN: Nothing from the defense.

THE COURT: All right. Again, I have already told you this, but both sides did an incredibly professional job,

```
Page 1307
    and both sides, obviously, put an incredible amount of work
 1
    into this case. And it clearly showed by the preparation and
 2
 3
    professionalism of the attorneys. I really appreciate it.
 4
              We will hear from people soon.
 5
                      (Proceedings concluded at 3:27 p.m.)
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
Page 1308
1
        STATE OF OREGON
2
                          )ss
        COUNTY OF YAMHILL)
3
4
                 I, Deborah L. Cook, RPR, Certified Shorthand
5
    Reporter in and for the State of Oregon, hereby certify that
6
7
    at said time and place I reported in stenotype all testimony
8
    adduced and other oral proceedings had in the foregoing
9
    hearing; that thereafter my notes were transcribed by
10
    computer-aided transcription by me personally; and that the
    foregoing transcript contains a full, true and correct record
11
12
    of such testimony adduced and other oral proceedings had, and
    of the whole thereof.
13
14
                 Witness my hand and seal at Dundee, Oregon, this
15
    1st day of June, 2018.
16
    /s/ Deborah L. Cook, RPR, CSR
17
18
    DEBORAH L. COOK, RPR
19
    Certified Shorthand Reporter
    OREGON CSR #04-0389
20
    CALIFORNIA CSR #12886
    WASHINGTON CSR #2992
21
22
23
24
25
```